

The Literary Digest.

VOL. I. NO. 25.

NEW YORK.

OCTOBER 11, 1890.

Entered at New York Post Office as second class matter.
Published Weekly by FUNK & WAGNALLS, 18 and 20 Astor Place, New York.
Subscription price, \$3.00 per year. Single copies, 10 cents.

CONTENTS.

THE REVIEWS.

POLITICAL:

A Word as to the Speakership.....	673
Why Patronage in Office is Un-American.....	674
Who Elected President Harrison.....	675
The Ideal Citizen.....	675
The Genius of France.....	676

SOCIOLOGICAL:

Social Problems and the Church.....	677
The Death Penalty.....	678
A Scheme of the Devil.....	679
Peace.....	680

EDUCATION, LITERATURE AND ART:

Education and the Working Man.....	681
Francisque Sarcey.....	681

SCIENTIFIC:

The Social Body.....	682
The Past and Future of Humanity in the Light of Evolution.....	683
The Criminal Responsibility of the Insane.....	684
Mutual Aid Among Animals.....	685

RELIGIOUS:

Old Lights and New.....	685
The Ethics of Evolution.....	686
Criteria of Catholic Truth.....	687

MISCELLANEOUS:

Pawtucket and the Slater Centennial.....	688
New Moneys of Lincoln's Administration.....	688

BOOKS.

The Wider Hope.....	689	Life of Dorothea Lynde Dix....	691
Holland and Its People.....	690	Dragon Flies vs. Mosquitoes....	691

THE PRESS.

POLITICAL:

Comment on the New Tariff.....	692
Mr. McKinley's Forlorn Hope.....	693
The Work of Congress.....	694
The Issue in Wisconsin.....	695
Civil Service Reform.....	695

FOREIGN:

Irish Affairs.....	695
The Manœuvres of the German Fleet.....	696

SOCIAL TOPICS.....

Is it a War of Extermination?.....	696
The Brick Boycott.....	697

TEMPERANCE.....

International Prohibition Congress.....	697
Nebraska Debating Society.....	697
The Man or the Party.....	698

MISCELLANEOUS.....

The Comte de Paris.....	698
Mormon Renunciation of Polygamy.....	698

INDEX OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE, 699

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.....	700	CURRENT EVENTS.....	700
------------------------	-----	---------------------	-----

The articles in The Review and Press Departments are condensations or summaries of the original articles, or of salient points in those articles. In no case are the editors of THE LITERARY DIGEST responsible for the opinions expressed, their constant endeavor being to present the thought of the author from his own point of view.

Articles from Foreign Periodicals are Translated for THE LITERARY DIGEST.

In order to increase the value of the Digest, as a repository of contemporaneous thought and opinion, every subscriber will be furnished with a complete and minute INDEX of each volume.

The Reviews.

POLITICAL.

A WORD AS TO THE SPEAKERSHIP.

JAMES BRYCE, M. P., AUTHOR OF "THE AMERICAN COMMONWEALTH."

North American Review, New York, October.

THE conduct of government by assemblies of men, instead of by individual men, is proverbially one of the most difficult things in the world. Where the number of an assembly rises beyond thirty or forty, so that conversation is superseded by speech-making, the difficulty increases in proportion. When the number passes one hundred and fifty or two hundred, a new element of trouble is introduced, in the excitement produced by the sympathy of a multitude, under whose influence men will say and do things which the judgment of a single man or a small group would at once condemn. To be efficient, a governing assembly must economize its time. It must be able to reach a prompt division and a clear decision—a decision,

which represents not a mixture of several discordant views, but that one self-consistent view which seems the best of all that have been suggested. There must, therefore, be some method of enabling an assembly to act promptly and vigorously—that is to say, of ascertaining its collective will and giving effect thereto. It was long ago perceived that the only way of determining and using the will of an assembly, in which there may be as many opinions and wills as there are individuals, is to take the will of the majority as being the will of the whole. The majority, therefore, is treated as if it were the whole assembly.

Nevertheless, a divided assembly cannot be treated as a unanimous assembly. Full and fair discussion of the questions to be decided must be secured, not simply for the sake of the so-called rights of the minority, but in the interests of the whole people whom the assembly represents. It is always possible, that discussion may change the views of the majority or affect opinion in the country at large. In either case, it is clearly desirable that the country should perceive that the matter has been duly considered, so that the minority may not go away with a rankling feeling of injustice, and that the law or act which the vote of the assembly has approved, may have the better chance of being loyally accepted and obeyed by the people as a whole.

The importance of these considerations was so much regarded in England, that no limit whatever was placed on the duration of Parliamentary debate until 1881, when in consequence of the persistent and protracted opposition to the Coercion Bill, some temporary rules called "Rules of Urgency" were passed, but have not since been revived. In 1882, however, a new set of regulations was enacted, and among these the power of closure—called in America "the previous question"—was for the first time introduced. Yet it is required that at least one hundred members shall vote in the majority for closure. The rules allow the Speaker to interpose his veto, or, rather, to refuse to put a motion actually made for ending the debate, where he thinks that the necessity for such a motion has not arisen. By this veto of the Speaker, he is enabled to protect minorities.

American readers may be surprised to hear that any protection for minorities was expected from the presiding officer. But in Parliament, the Speaker and the chairman of committees (whom for shortness I generally include when I refer to the Speaker) are, and have always been, non-partisan officials. The Speaker is not permitted, so long as he holds office, to deliver any party speech outside Parliament, or even to express his opinion on any party question; and in the chair itself he must be scrupulously fair to both parties, equally accessible to all members, bound to give his advice on points of order without distinction to those who ask it. Thus, the closure, though now more frequently applied than was intended when it was introduced in 1882, has curtailed the freedom of debate much less than might have been expected.

The conclusions which may be fairly deduced from the history of Parliamentary procedure in England, during the last ten years, seem to be the following:

That some power of terminating debate by closure, or previous question, had become absolutely necessary.

That a majority is certain to abuse this power—i. e., to use it where it is not absolutely required, and where its use is not only oppressive, but prejudicial to the public interest.

That the veto of the Chair has tended to check such abuse and has given frequent protection to the minority.

That the conduct of the Chair, whether or not it has been always right, has been invariably impartial so far as intentions went, and that its reputation has not hitherto suffered.

That it is, nevertheless, possible that English minorities and majorities may in the future desire to have a partisan in the chair, seeing how helpful he may be to them, and that the traditional character of the speakership is, therefore, not exempt from danger.

On the whole, therefore, we in England are not disposed to retrace the steps we have taken. The House of Commons could not get on without a closure. But the incidental evils are real evils, and we look with some anxiety to the future.

There are three conspicuous differences between the position and practice of either House of Congress and that of either House of Parliament.

The House of Representatives is not supreme over its own procedure. It is subject to the Constitution, which has absolutely secured to the minority of one-fifth of a quorum the right to have the names of the yeas and nays on a division entered on the journal—a right which not only tends, but invites, to filibustering.

In the United States long habit has made the Speaker a recognized partisan—a partisan limited, no doubt, by usage and good feeling, but still understood to be entitled to use his power in the interest of his party.

In both Houses of Congress another long habit has established the right of members to be physically present during a division and yet to abstain from voting. In both Houses of Parliament every member present has always been held bound to vote, and recusant members have more than once been positively compelled to vote.

As regards the power of the Speaker of the House of Representatives to refuse to put a dilatory motion which he deems frivolous or obstructive, the same power has been recently given to the English Speaker and used with results generally admitted (up to the date of this writing) to be excellent. Whether it would be equally safe in the hands of the Speaker at Washington is a point on which a stranger must not express an opinion, though he may remark that the bestowal of this power on the Speaker in England would have been resisted, but for the confidence felt in the superiority of that officer to party bias.

Speaker Reed has suggested the referring the decision of contested elections to a judicial tribunal instead of to a committee of the House. English experience is certainly such as to recommend the plan for at least a provisional adoption in America.

WHY PATRONAGE IN OFFICE IS UN-AMERICAN.

HENRY CABOT LODGE.

The Century, New York, October.

CIVIL Service Reform has had a stormy existence of twenty-three years. It has moved along, amid the abuse of foes who have sneered at its advocates, and the loud praise of friends, who have showered much indiscriminate invective on all its enemies, real and supposed. Like other causes, at bottom righteous, it has marched forward, slowly and painfully, yet still forward. Nevertheless, in all the noise and dust and shouting, the precise thing wanted occasionally becomes dim, the line of march is sometimes lost, and the results reached are often hidden from sight. Any one who watches the course of a reform like this, and sees it struggling among confusions born of much violent argument and talking hither and thither, for and against, is strongly tempted to cry out with Carlyle: "Oh, shrieking, beloved, brother blockheads of mankind! let us close those wide mouths of ours; let us cease shrieking and begin considering." As Mr. Webster said on a celebrated occasion, after

tossing on the waves of debate it is well to take our latitude, and see how far we have been driven from the true course.

This is especially desirable in this instance, for no movement has ever suffered more through needless misstatements, both of friends and foes. The very name itself is misleading, for the real intent of the movement is not to reform the civil service, but to change the mode by which its places are filled. The purpose of Civil Service Reform is, to take the routine offices of the Government which are not political out of politics, where they ought never to have been, and to substitute for personal patronage, some system which shall be impersonal and disinterested.

The name, however, is the least of the difficulties. Both friend and foe seem to have conspired to pile up confusions about the movement. To begin with, there seems to be an absolute determination to misstate the case historically—to indicate a point at which the "spoils system" had its birth. The theory coincides pleasantly with the delusion that things political are much worse than they used to be, that we have fallen away sadly from the high standard of the fathers and founders of the Republic, that the only statesmen are dead statesmen, and that living public men are mere "politicians." That in the good old days—exact date not given—everybody who held office was good and able, and was chosen or appointed solely from merit, while selfish politicians and mercenary lobbyists were unknown.

It appears to have passed into a dogma that political patronage began with Andrew Jackson. The exact truth is very different. When the Government of the United States was formed, the only theory in regard to appointments in office was the one then in vogue everywhere, to the effect that they were matters within the personal gift of the Chief Executive or his representatives. Acting on this theory, Washington appointed the officers of the Government according to his good pleasure. That he was guided by the highest and most disinterested motives and enlightened by the best information he could obtain in making his selections, cannot be doubted. But it is equally certain, that he distributed the offices solely as a matter of patronage; that at the start, with few exceptions, he appointed only friends of the Constitution, and that after the development of parties, he appointed only Federalists, laying down plainly, in more than one letter, the doctrine that none but those who were friendly to the Government ought to receive the offices. John Adams pursued the same general policy. No plainer statement of the spoils system was ever made than that laid down by Jefferson, in the following letter to the New Haven remonstrants: "If a due participation of office is a matter of right, how are vacancies to be obtained? Those by death are few; by resignation none; can any other mode than that of removal be proposed? This is a painful office, and I meet it as such." As Mr. Adams says with quiet sarcasm in his "History of the United States," Jefferson did not go so "far as to assert that to the victors belong the spoils; he contented himself with claiming that to the victors belonged half the spoils." The restriction was characteristic of the man, and less honest than Jackson's bold and frank determination to have everything, but the principle in both cases was precisely the same.

In the interval between Jefferson and Jackson political patronage subsided, but the real reason is attributable to the long continuance of one party in power, followed by the disappearance of the Federalists and the merging of all parties—nominally at least—in one. The system, however, remained entirely at bottom unchanged, and when Jackson came into power with a new set of ideas, he merely put into active operation a practice which had slumbered for twenty years, but which had been the same from the beginning. Dating the system from Jackson's time, therefore, is dating it from the declaration of the formula, which has no real connection with either its origin or practice. Since Jackson's day, as the

Government has grown, political patronage has grown and spread, until it has assumed the enormous proportions with which the present generation is familiar. The effort to do away with it, by an impersonal and disinterested machinery of appointment, is a wholly modern idea, and is not, in any sense, a reversion to the early practice of the Republic.

The opponent of reform is loud in his contention, that the patronage system has always existed in this country, that it is the American system, and that the attempt of the reformers is to put something new and wholly un-American in its place. The proposition is wildly false. Patronage in office is in no sense a peculiarly American institution. We brought the patronage system with us from the old world. Sir Robert Walpole developed this system with his wonted ability, and made it one of the bulwarks of the unquestioned sway which he held, so long. When England had cast off the rotten boroughs and extended her suffrage, when her government became democratic instead of aristocratic, the royal and aristocratic system of patronage broke down.

The system of patronage in office we have always had; but it is none the less an inheritance born of despotisms and aristocracies, and it is the merest cant to call it American. It is a system of favoritism and nepotism, of political influence and personal intrigue. It is the system by which Louis XIV. and his successors drained the life blood of the French people, and by which Sir Robert Walpole and his successors corrupted the British Parliament; it is utterly abhorrent to the ideas upon which the Democratic Government of the United States has been founded, and has no proper place on American soil.

WHO ELECTED PRESIDENT HARRISON?

THE HON. ALBERT GRIFFIN.

The Statesman, Chicago, September.

THOSE who preferred him and his party to any other candidate and party, and those who were unwilling that Cleveland should be elected. His vote was not confined to those who endorsed all of his acts and views, and those of his party, for few thinking men ever do this by any man or party. Most voters' position is, "Taking everything into consideration, I believe my vote will be more likely to secure good results or prevent evil, if cast for this ticket, than it would be if cast for any other." Vicious men often vote for those who are personally pure, free traders for protectionists, saloonists for enemies of their business, and *vice versa*. The intelligent man who decides to support no candidate or party that does not agree with him on all points, must vote for himself for every office. Whether the voter realizes it or not, numerous considerations have more or less influence on his decision. It is usually easy to name the most important ones, but even their relative power cannot be definitely computed. The trend of any great party on any leading question can be ascertained by those who really desire to know the truth; but it is always easy, by carefully selecting isolated facts and individual utterances, to apparently prove that it is going in an opposite direction, or several ways at once.

The Prohibition Party Committee has published a tract, written by M. J. Fanning, to clear up the question, "Who killed Cock Robin Cleveland?" Heretofore there were two P. P. theories on this subject—money—treachery. "Harrison's election was bought. Yes, sir, bought! Bought with boodle!" And again: "The Republicans sold out their candidate for Governor, Warner Miller, to get votes for Harrison. They had 15,000 majority in the State and could have elected Miller if they had wanted to." These two theories are very much conflicting. But now comes Mr. Fanning with a third theory that, if correct, effectually disposes of both the other theories. According to him, Miller got more Republican votes than Harrison, and consequently, if there was any

treachery, Harrison, and not Miller, was the victim. Mr. Fanning is sure that Harrison got his extra votes from Democrats who, believing that "Democratic success threatened the distilling business," bolted Cleveland and elected Harrison in the interest of the liquor power. Of course, if this is true, the Republicans did not have to buy men with money.

Mr. Fanning has carefully culled 66 wards in the cities of New York, Brooklyn, Albany, Buffalo, Rochester, Long Island City, Syracuse and Utica (those in New York City being legislative districts, however), and says that outside of them "Miller, the defeated candidate, polled eleven more votes than Harrison. And he adds, "A study of these wards reveals the fact that *the gain was due to liquor men in the Democratic party* who deserted Cleveland and voted for Harrison." Mr. Fanning, probably, really believes that he has discovered a veritable mare's nest, invisible to every one else. His elaborate culling and figuring simply show, that the Republican State ticket, against which the entire liquor power made a most violent fight, ran behind Harrison 19,045 votes in a total party vote of 650,338—and that it was greatest where the saloon is strongest—which is cheerfully admitted. But when he infers therefrom, that this excess consisted of Democratic bolters in the interest of whiskey, I insist that there is not a particle of evidence to sustain the assumption.

On July 29th last, Senator Hiscock of New York, a cautious conservative and reputable man, who knows more about the Harrison campaign in his State than any other man, with few exceptions, made on the McKinley Bill a speech, in which he hurled his glove, as never before, defiantly into the face of the liquor power. Such utterances from such a man, made as the lines are forming for another campaign, prove that New York Republicans realize now, if they did not two years ago, that the saloon is the natural and implacable enemy of their party.

Let me state two corroborative facts. 1. Not a periodical published in the interest of the liquor business, anywhere in the United States, supported Harrison or the Republican party, and nearly, if not quite every one of them, more or less openly supported Cleveland. Indeed I never heard of a liquor trade paper that ever supported the Republican party. 2. No liquor dealers' convention or organization ever directly or indirectly, openly or secretly, endorsed or supported the Republican party, while many of them have opposed it. Individuals connected with them have been genuine Republicans; but always scarce, they are now exceedingly lonesome, and will soon be an extinct species.

I close as I began. The voters who elected President Harrison are correctly described in the opening sentences of this paper.

THE IDEAL CITIZEN.

JOHN HABBERTON.

Civics, New York, October.

THE ideal citizen is the man who believes that all men are brothers, and the nation merely an extension of his family, to be loved, respected and cared for accordingly.

Such a man attends personally to all the civic duties with which he believes himself charged, intrusting none within his own control to his inferiors. He knows that any blunder in the management of public affairs may inflict disagreeable, expensive and perhaps fatal, results upon himself and those he most loves; and in a larger way he realizes, that the men and women about him whom he respects as his equals, and those whom he pities because they are unable to look after their own rights under the law, may suffer alike, if a few intelligent citizens chance to neglect their duty. He never assumes, that what he neglects to attend to will be made right by his fellow-men, to whom he will return the favor at some future time. He has seen that method in practice, and dreads

its effects. The "Tweed Ring," in New York, and the "Whiskey Ring," in Washington, are warning examples. He realizes that in civic affairs "a stitch in time saves nine," and that, if not taken in time, rents and exposures may occur, which cannot be repaired in time to prevent disgrace and loss. He always "wants to know why;" and loses no opportunity to discover what have been the stumbling-blocks of other communities, States and nations; and he prefers to learn them from original sources of information, rather than from persons who make eleventh-hour explanations, for selfish or partisan purposes.

In politics, the ideal citizen takes sides and votes with a party; but he makes his partisan affiliations through principle, not prejudice or personal acquaintance. He realizes that to be led by the nose is unmanly, even though the leader be a wiser man than he and a personal friend besides; and that to follow blindly, is to give way to the weakness through which leaders have become tyrants and nations have lost their liberties. In politics, his conscientious decisions may compel him to oppose some of his dearest friends; for there is a good deal besides conscience that makes differences of opinion, and to accept ideas at second hand, no matter from whom, is to admit that one is not fit to think for himself, but only to be a slave. He may respect men with whom he differs in opinion, but need not on that account adopt their erroneous ideas. It is the man who does his own thinking that is remembered; he who only follows, has nothing in his character to keep his memory green.

Sometimes the ideal citizen finds himself obliged to vote with the party which he has previously opposed, and in which his associates are his old political enemies. This is painful, for, as a rule, the more thoughtful and earnest the man, the dearer to him are the ties of sympathy and old association. But if he would be true to his trust, duty must be regarded before inclination. It needs bravery to make an ideal citizen.

To the ideal citizen, there is no necessary connection between local necessities and national issues. He does not vote for a candidate for constable or town clerk, because he belongs to his party, but because of his qualifications for the office. He votes for the best man, no matter which party may name him.

He believes with the Father of his Country that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty;" hence no public interest is too small to receive his attention. Instead of concentrating his attention and spending his money once in four years to elect the presidential candidate of his party, he attends all primary meetings, and never fails to vote at any election.

The ideal citizen is a disturbing influence in his own political fold, and is pretty sure to be regarded as a nuisance. But parties grow in wisdom, through agitation by men whom they may eventually cast out; and even though he may thus be made a martyr, the ideal citizen does not put on the air of a martyr, but continues to do battle with a brave heart, a cheerful face, and an honest hope that the best man may win, even if the loser be himself. His compensation consists in the sense of duty well done, and the more he does, the less reward he thinks himself entitled to.

THE GENIUS OF FRANCE.

BERNARD C. DE LISLE.

Westminster Review, London, September.

WHAT a strange, unintelligible nation is modern France; at once the most revolutionary and the most conservative of European powers! To her neighbors, an ever restless people who will leave nothing alone. The powers that be are in a continual tremor, lest some new departure in constitution-mongering should be passed through the two Chambers and receive the Presidential assent. Why should it matter to

other countries if it be. The watchfulness which European statesmen keep on French affairs is curious—an untiring vigilance, notwithstanding the humiliation of 1870, when France was supposed to be relegated to a secondary place in the councils of the nations for some time to come. France at least having shaken herself free by her downfall, her extraordinary recuperative energy has enabled her to take a conspicuous place among the nations, and with a now generally admitted strong organization at home, she can uphold the principles of the rights of man, for which she has struggled since 1789. With renewed vigor once more these principles threaten the old structure of society throughout Europe. It is because the abstract principles of philosophers become in French hands practical and well defined, and, therefore, find an echo among the peoples of other lands, that statesmen find it necessary to keep such strict watch on France. Already Germany must unite with Austria and Italy to stay the progress of her conquered rival. What is the reason of this? It is not so much the men that France can put in the field, as that the principles of liberalism, which would at once receive a great impetus were she again the leading nation in Europe, are favored by a large and increasing number of people throughout the world.

Sir Charles Dilke has said, that the twentieth century would see only three great nations, Great Britain, Russia and the United States. But the twentieth century is upon us, and the tendency of change appears to be on other lines. The history of France for the last thousand years has been a struggle for life against repeated hostile combinations. How was it possible to wage war like this continually, one against so many? The answer seems to be, that the conflict was not so much between State and State, as between ideas. Europe takes one standpoint, France another. That of Europe is based on tradition, that of France on the probabilities of the future. A good instance illustrating this is the action of Philip the Fair as regards Pope Boniface VIII. In the zenith of the Papal power, Philip shocks all Europe, nearly two centuries before the birth of Luther, by publicly consigning a Papal Bull to the flames. An article in the *Nouvelle Revue* for July 1, 1890, entitled, *Dans quel pays la Reforme a-t-elle prise naissance?* shows how the real cradle of Protestantism was France, not Germany.

But we are wandering from the question, which was, whether France would be included in the Great Powers of the twentieth century. Against the lack of physical force resulting from a stationary population we place the fecundity of idea. The strength of the Republic now is, that it is the chief exponent of the liberalism first put into practice, awkwardly and cruelly no doubt, in 1789, and which at once found an echo in all lands. A century later, France having shaken herself free of the Napoleonic curse, again rises to uphold the philosophy of 1789, which has made progress during the interval. As she rises, her victorious rival sinks. The German victors recognized that the greatest blow which could be given to modern liberalism, would be the complete prostration of their hereditary enemy. But twenty years have scarcely elapsed since the coronation of the Emperor William, the exponent of the monarchical principle, in the palace of Louis XIV., and his grandson sees the necessity of abandoning the cause for which he fought and won. The crushing defeat of the third Napoleon at Sedan was no more crushing than the defeat of the first Napoleon at Waterloo; each terminated the career of a grasping, selfish man, each gave a blow to the new ideas of freedom by giving over to Germany the supremacy of Europe. Neither defeat was final. Now, again, the principles of the vanquished nation are gaining ground day by day, while those of their victors are sinking as rapidly.

It is thus that we see a future for the genius of France,

and give her a place among the great powers of coming times. Moreover, the advantages of geographical position, which France lost with the opening of the St. Gothard and the South Eastern railways, and with the establishment of the commercial line from America through England to Antwerp and Hamburg, and thence through Germany, Austria and Italy to the East, are again about to be restored. With the rush of civilization into the Dark Continent, France immediately regains her central position, both for herself in Europe and for her possessions in Africa. Our own rulers are perhaps inclined to take a slightly too contemptuous view of our neighbors, by which they might get into serious difficulties in the future. Already a passive alliance exists between France and Russia. But we are further struggling with the United States, and it would be small evidence of our political capacity, if we were some day to find ourselves confronted with another and a stronger triple alliance, consisting of France, Russia and the United States.

SOCIOLOGICAL.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS AND THE CHURCH.

BISHOP F. D. HUNTINGTON.

The Forum, New York, October.

WHEN a great mixed audience in one of the public halls in New York cheered the name of Jesus Christ and hissed the name of the Church, it was as significant as half the sermons that are preached. There have been times when the people heard the words "Christ and the Church" with reverent silence, if not with enthusiastic devotion. There have been a few fanatical disbelievers, who have cursed both the Nazarene and his Kingdom. Only in these later days, when workingmen read, reason and reflect, does a promiscuous crowd rudely, rather than irreverently, take the two apart, honoring the one and scouting the other.

No matter where or in what age the Church is found, or what influences play upon it, the guide of its life must be one and the same. The working law and rule of action are in the constitution, and the constitution of the Church is Christ. No inference can be plainer, than that the duty of the Church to the unprivileged is to be learned from the treatment they received in the personal bearing, acts and teachings of the Christ of the New Testament, and it is not pretended, we believe, that there is any other Christ. Let it be assumed that the word "Church" includes all persons who "profess and call themselves Christians." The term "unprivileged" is used for a class, rather than other terms like "lower," "laboring," "poor," or "proletarian," as being, on the whole, descriptive, fair, respectful and comprehensive.

For the present purpose it is assumed, passing by all critical and exegetical questions, that the ethical contents of Christianity are due to a person from whose name that word is derived. The sublime proclamation at Nazareth—"The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord"—which announced the new kingdom, declaring its fundamental and everlasting principle, is not in dispute. Where the Church, swayed by selfish privilege, has been false to its head, it has contented itself with letting this passage stand untouched.

Christ recognized classes as actual, but not as necessary, or even as legitimate, in the order of society which he came to establish. The prophetic master did not make differences of property, rank or station the ground of favor or of standing

in his new society. In the judgment immediately coming, men would not be accounted of by anything outside of them. The tribunal would be more awful than that, searching and inevitable. The rich are not condemned because they are rich, but because of what they allow their riches to make of them, or of the way such riches have been obtained or used; and there is no bitterness in the condemnation. Riches have spoilt manhood, the only thing worth keeping; and that is the "woe." Neither are the poor approved, praised or blessed because of their poverty, destitution, or its material incidents. They are a Christian aristocracy, so far as their hardship has developed and enlarged in them traits which ease and luxury have emasculated in the rich, leaving them frivolous, indolent, selfish and cruel. The penalty falls not on them that *have riches*, but on them that *trust in riches*—putting riches in place of a divine magnanimity, justice, and self-sacrifice.

There is no denying that this head of a new earth and new heavens, did see the two classes which the world had sundered, and that he made his choice between them. There is no beatitude that reads, "Blessed are the rich, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." It is all the other way. We all know it would not be a gospel, if it were otherwise. No audacity can deny it; no money king, no queen of fashion, no ingenious exegesis can expunge it from the record, or alter or blur the handwriting. Christ's men are to be brothers, and in no twisted or hidden sense. His society is to be a society of liberty, of justice, of equal rights (not faculties or possessions), of out-and-out fairness, of thorough-going good-will. Out of this oracle, constitution, and personal life alone the Church is to take its answers to the questions as to what its duty is respecting social problems.

As operating through human agencies, the Church has an ecclesiastical apparatus, policy, financial system, officers and honors. One of its primary duties is to keep this array of machinery free from favoritism, conceding nothing to the ambition, arrogance, pride or fastidiousness of wealth. To people who read little and think less, this machinery is looked upon as the Church, and stands as the inarticulate but significant interpretation of church Christianity. They either regard it as the Christianity of Christ, or else, with keener perception, as in the case first mentioned, they discriminate, hissing the Church and applauding the great Working-man.

More than half the religious organizations, large or small, are at present practical contradictions of the sermon on the Mount. It does not need an ostentatious hierarchy to open the door for the "prince of the world," letting him in where he does tenfold the mischief he could do by persecutions, seductions or infidel arguments outside. He buys up property, holds the keys of pew doors, puts rich families in the foremost seats, hires and pays the choir, raises funds by lotteries and theatricals, tells the "lower classes" to stay out in the streets, or patronizes them with a mission chapel in the outskirts, makes a fashion plate of the female worshippers, sees to it that parish offices and other marks of distinction are assigned to prosperous merchants, politicians, and leaders of society—never to mechanics and day laborers who have no qualifications except piety and good sense—suits the preacher to the tastes of the ruling set, and "runs the concern." What is all this parochial mammonism and snobbery but a surrender of the kingdom of the crucified to his adversary? Where is the divine brotherhood?

The Church will further do its duty by a generous, and if need be a forbearing, sympathy with the movements and measures, not bearing its name, which are the products of the "labor problem." They are not political insurrections, and will not be, if the duty of the Church is done. They are not communistic phantasies. They have an inherent vitality, a plausible reason, numerical strength, and a spreading activity. Their fatal inconsistency, their sad incapacity of unification, their pathetic lack of leadership, the Church of the Shepherd King will look on with pity, not contempt. Why does not the Church make itself their leader? Why

should not organized Christianity prove itself to be the most perfect system of democracy? There are social sins and human equities, which have a more urgent and imperative claim upon the consideration of ecclesiastical councils and of weekly sermons, than any questions of discipline, hymnology or predestination. There is a sense of right, which can be stirred without personal vituperation by men called and set apart to holy offices, if they are sincere and candid, and if their lives agree with their preaching. Is it said, that such preaching would foster violence and provoke insurrectionary clamor? Telling the truth has generally been pretty safe in the long run, and never safer than now, when the truth is likely to be told at any rate. An earnest and patient treatment of social wrongs by a wide and large-hearted Church, is as likely as Congress or the courts to heal discontent and to forestall insurrection.

Apart from all material suffering, which is so often the lot of the unprivileged, it is inevitable that a class spirit should be engendered, with its estranging and embittering ingredients. The friction is the more unhealthy, as it becomes manifest that the distinction is not one of moral dignity, birth, or even breeding, but of cunning or chance. It is therefore anti-Republican and anti-Christian. It is not the purpose of this writing to consider the ultimate effects of this false relation upon the body politic, but to show what obligation it lays upon the Church. As to measures or methods, the Church has little to say which has not been said from the beginning. These will appear as wanted, when there are faith and wisdom and will to order and to regulate them. The time has come when workmen ask not charity, but justice; not the property of other men, but their own; God's common gifts to the people for the people's use; nothing more. If strikes and strikers demand more, the Church cannot countenance their demand. The official report shows in the State of New York, during the past five years, 9,384 strikes, with 338,900 laborers taking part in them. It is improbable that anything like that number of sane men in this country would hazard their livelihood without cause.

Yet it is not the Church's business to advocate or promote strikes. Nor may it be more reasonably expected, in the face of recent developments, to encourage soup kitchens, poor laws, the old-time dole, or the distribution of cast-off clothing. It must achieve its gracious ends, if at all, by creating convictions in all classes, which will render these unhealthy remedies of an unhealthy condition superfluous, and by allying itself fearlessly with all the restorative forces that are rising into action in the mind and conscience of our time. Above all it must remember, that what is sought in behalf of the suffering class first and foremost, is not their material, but their moral elevation—their spiritual salvation . . . The whole matter is degraded and belittled, if we forget that the worst evil, even among the poor, is not their poverty. There must be a higher aspiration and a deeper longing in them, and in us who try to help them, than to obtain an easier lot, more to eat and drink and wear, or more leisure for dissipation, indolence and amusement.

THE DEATH PENALTY.

GEORGE F. SHRADY, A.M., M.D.

The Arena, Boston, October.

THE execution by electricity which has recently taken place, has brought to the surface of general discussion, a subject of the greatest concern to society at large. Upon the electric chair at Auburn was focussed the new light of a world-wide interest. It was promised that the new method of getting rid of a murderer should be an improvement upon all others. History must now record its failure from many points of view. When the harrowing details of the death chamber were tingled along the telegraph wires of the country, the entire civilized world viewed the scene with astonished horror.

As now shown, there was no accurate and reliable way of determining positively when real death occurred. Although

the respiratory struggles of the criminal after the first shock were as free from pain as if the man had been under the influence of an anæsthetic, there is little doubt that he might have rallied if the shock had not been repeated. Judging by this experience, it cannot be claimed that the first use of electricity as a means of producing death easily, quickly, and, as some have claimed, "pleasantly," was by any means a success. From the administration of the first stroke until the current was finally interrupted, five minutes and twenty-eight seconds elapsed. The execution was then certainly not as quick as lightning. The only comfort they can take who have advocated the new plan is, that the first current was a stunning one. But, in the other methods of inflicting the death penalty is there more suffering?

Excepting, perhaps, the Russian plan of execution by the knout, the dreadful element of pain to the individual is hardly worthy of consideration. With the guillotine, the Japanese sword, the Spanish garrote, death is practically instantaneous, and so with hanging. The instant the noose tightens its choking grip, consciousness is gone.

In studying the *technique* of executions, it is interesting to note a desire, on the part of those who believe in these forms of punishment, to inflict as little suffering as possible upon the condemned one. This is as it should be, and is so far a credit to our present civilization. There are some who claim, that the more severe, revolting and cruel we make an execution, the better it will serve its purpose. It is to be regretted that even clergymen are to be found among the stanch advocates of this obnoxious doctrine. The argument is, that capital punishment and the horrors which attend it have a deterrent effect upon murder. How much of truth and fact is there in the plea?

In the vast majority of cases, murder is an accident of passion in an individual who has lost his self-control. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, he is a weak vessel, a crooked pot that has been jarred out of his equilibrium. He was born crooked. The criminal is born, not made. There is as much heredity in crime as in consumption, cancer, or insanity. The statistics of prisons show that crime, in one shape or another, can trickle through families even to the sixth generation. The criminal comes into the world with a defect in his moral constitution, and unless this is counteracted by the proper educating influences, he is in the long run as sure to commit crime as are the sparks to fly upward. The criminal will always fit his environment. The murder, for instance, is the fruition of the seed in the proper ground. The act is almost an instinct of his living. To prevent it would be to kill him before, not after, the act is done, or, better still, one should be able to forbid the matrimonial banns of his ancestors.

These seeds of crime are being constantly sown in our midst, and we can no more guard against this condition of things by executing criminals, than we can, by destroying the fruit of one seed, hinder other and similar seeds from taking root. Conviction is the exception rather than the rule, and the hope of escape outweighs the fear of punishment. But the real cause in the individual is mostly beyond our reach. We have no means of knowing his proclivities towards murder, until the deed is done. Even if it were otherwise, the gallows would have no more terrors for him than for any other man. Until after the murder is committed, he has been accustomed to believe that the guillotine or the rope was intended for some one else. No individual, no matter how depraved he is, ever expects to be a murderer, and, consequently, he never feels the need of the lesson from the scaffold. If he learns it at all, it is too late to do any good to his victim or himself.

Society, in its retroactive influence, has as much to do with the commission of the crime, as the criminal himself has. There is a social as well as a physical law for crime. Given a certain condition of society, and the ratio of murders is always

the same, no matter how severe the punishment of the crime may be. The number of murders never varies, it is as constant as the birth rate and the death rate.

Then why kill the criminal at all. If life is sacred, why sanction one murder because another has been committed. If we do not want revenge; if our sole object is the protection of society by doing away with the criminal in the simplest and most effectual manner, why not resort to life imprisonment? Society absolves itself from the crime of a second murder, and as securely guards itself from future harm, as if the criminal were dead already. But the treatment should be rigorous, the murderer should be isolated—treated as a moral leper. Here, too, we should study his characteristics, as we do the symptoms of disease. What valuable statistics as to hereditary dispositions and the influence of particular environments might we not thus obtain? And while we are looking for more light, let us study him, not kill him. There are laws of crime, as there are laws for the winds and tides, and the science of jurisprudence must be based upon a proper understanding of them. We may yet discover where the real responsibility for crime rests. We may be able in time to demonstrate which is most to blame, the instincts of the criminal, or the influences of the society in which he lives and moves.

A SCHEME OF THE DEVIL.

THE REV. H. A. THOMPSON.

Quarterly Review of the United Brethren in Christ, Dayton, O.

THE first attempt of the government to deal with this dreadful traffic was by a process of regulation termed license. The State of Massachusetts has the earliest, and perhaps the most complete records on this subject. As early as 1636 it was ordered "that none be suffered to retail wine, strong water or beer, within doors or without, except in inns or victualling houses allowed." The underlying assumption in all this legislation was, that strong drink was a proper thing to be sold in connection with public houses of entertainment, and was in the main for the accommodation of guests and travellers. It was soon found that these public houses, while not intended for entertainment and harboring of lewd or idle people to spend or consume their time or money therein, were being used as such; hence greater restrictions were necessary.

As unquestioned testimony to the blessed (?) results of license in restraining the traffic in strong drink, read the following from the diary of John Adams: "Few things, I believe, have deviated so far from the first design of their institution, are so fruitful of destructive evils or so needful of a speedy regulation as license houses. At the present day such houses are become the eternal haunt of loose, disorderly people of the same town, which renders them offensive and unfit for the entertainment of a traveler of the least delicacy. . . . But the worst effect of all, and which ought to make each man who has the least sense of his privileges tremble, these houses are become in many places the nurseries of our legislators. . . ."

While wrong in theory, these laws were just as inefficient in results. The opinions of the best class of observers were summed up by Linus Child on behalf of a committee of the Legislature in 1838. "Laws professing to regulate the sale of spirituous liquors have, it is believed, existed in every State of the Union. But has their effect been to check the progress of intemperance? . . . It may well be doubted whether intemperance would have increased with more rapid strides if no legislative regulations of the sale of intoxicating liquors had ever been made." So moderate a man as Governor Bullock, acting in 1861 as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, on the part of the House in that capacity gave this testimony: "It may be taken to be the solemnly declared judgment of

the people of this commonwealth, that the principle of licensing a traffic in intoxicating drinks as a beverage, and thus giving legal sanction to that which in itself is regarded as an evil, is no longer admissible in morals or legislation."

Says Dr. Minor of Boston: "Some people say the license law is a failure. I think that is a mistake. It is a complete success. It has accomplished exactly what its framers expected. It has made selling easy and drinking plentiful."

It has remained for the so-called temperance men of this day to revamp this old fraud of license, and to pass it off on unsuspecting people, chiefly innocent church members, as a radical temperance measure. The only modification they make is, that in former times the license fee was not sufficiently large. Increase it one or two hundred dollars. Call it high license, and lo! what blessed results. We repeat, it is the same old harlot with her features newly painted and her dress a little more gaudy, but as brazen-faced and immoral as she was before.

(1) The advocates of high-license, from a temperance standpoint, claim that it gives us fewer saloons; if it did, it does not follow that the consumption of drink would be less; but the reduction in number of saloons, as tested in Chicago, is very inconsiderable.

In 1882-3 with	\$50 per annum,	3,849 licenses issued.
In 1883-4 "	\$100 "	3,682 "
In 1884-5 "	\$500 "	3,336 "
In 1885-6 "	\$500 "	3,390 "

(2) It is claimed that high license gives us *better saloons* by crushing out the lowest ones. Facts will not warrant any such statement. The grand jury of Cook county, which includes Chicago, testify: "Dens of the lowest order defy the city ordinances by keeping open from dawn until midnight, and from midnight to dawn, where congregate disreputable women, thieves and criminals well known to the police."

3. It increases the revenue, and makes the saloon bear a part of the burdens which the traffic imposes on the community. This is in a sense true; but in an infernal business like this, which brings wreck and ruin in its course, and unfits not only for this life but the life to come, there should be no question of money. The Dow Law tax in Ohio, brought us in a revenue of about two million dollars, while the cost to the State, in so far as it could be estimated, was seventy millions.

(4) *It is a stepping-stone to prohibition.* So many honest people have thought in the past, but the statement is absolutely false. It provides for the continuance and not for the destruction of the traffic. Liquor dealers themselves favor it, because they say it wards off prohibition. Liquor men and liquor papers universally favor high license; the only surprising thing is that temperance men and ministers of the gospel and church people regard it as a temperance measure.

In addition to all this we further protest against licensing the liquor traffic, because

(1) *It is not a legitimate business, it does not help a community.* It is the universal ally of all evil, and the antagonist of all good. It takes that for which it gives no fair equivalent. If all the saloons and distilleries in the land should burn to-night, we should be better off to-morrow morning than we are to-day. There is not a precept of the decalogue which it does not violate, not a crime which it does not commit. There is no pencil to paint, no pen to describe the ravages of the monster. A pen of thunder dipped in the lightning's flash, and held by angelic fingers, could not record a tithe of his ravages.

(2) High license makes the government a *partaker of the crime*. The men who are in the business are the agents of the government.

(3) *Licensed men are a privileged class.* If it is a proper business, it should be free and open to all. If it is too bad to be free, it is too bad to be at all.

(4) *It looks to the perpetuity of an infamous traffic, which the strong arm of the law should be used to crush.*

(5) *It demoralizes the public conscience.*

Can the scheme of high license be anything less than a scheme of the devil for the benumbing of the moral sense, so that he can the more easily carry on his infamous purpose?

PEACE.

R. BONGHI.

Nuova Antologia, Rome, September.

WE have peace in Europe, a peace hideous with arms and pregnant with war, a peace which, every year that it lasts, increases the expense of its cost, and which is especially maintained by the fear that makes war on the very nations who are most anxious to prepare the means of victory. It is a peace, if I may be allowed so to say, of barbarians, of men who are not attracted to it by any moral instinct, who do not admire it for its humanity, do not love it for its beauty and virtue, but who, full of trepidation, feel restrained, because they know not how great ruin a new encounter among the civilized States of Europe would cause. It is not of such a peace that I desire to speak; but rather of a peace which will be born, when it is born, out of profound conviction by the people and governments of Europe, that they will honor the civilization of which they boast, if they make it Christian in their relations with each other, as they have made, or rather tried to make, it in each State; and that, to make civilization thus, they must change above all, their mind and their will, and fill these with true light and render them good; since to men, in whose spirit light and good-will abounds, has been promised true peace.

These last words will nowhere be more laughed at than in my country. The Italians believe themselves to be consummate politicians. They remember that in the days when they were divided into petty governments, they won by force of arms the union which makes them great. They bear the burdens of this peace in patience, both because they believe it to be the only way in which their hardly earned union can be preserved against foreign forces, and because they have formed an ideal of war as a noble and generous strife in which valor and great qualities of mind and spirit will gain for them honors and rewards.

But war has entirely changed its face. It is not yet divested of the mental qualities which are required for victory; contempt of danger, constancy in facing it, intrepidity in awaiting it; but victory has ceased to be the result of these alone. It becomes every day more and more the work of engineers and mechanics; it has lost everything that could stimulate chivalric instincts and excite courage and valor. Science, leaving its legitimate function of ministering to human existence and of supplying the needs of men, has been pressed into the service of war, and its energies are now largely applied to forge deadly arms of destruction and terrible engines of slaughter. We are far from seeing the end of inventions which can be instruments of carnage. The two last inventions of this kind, I believe, are these: At New York has been invented a cannon costing \$50,000, which weighs eighty tons, and is charged with dynamite; its shell, filled with a hundred pounds of this explosive, shot into a great city, would cause greater destruction than an earthquake. At the West End of London has been tried the Giffard cannon, which needs no powder to load it with, and makes no smoke on its discharge; it is discharged by liquified carbonic acid gas; and can be fired two or three hundred times consecutively, at a cost, it is said, of two-pence a discharge. Such things go far to prove that modern war is a brutal thing, worthy of savages, and ought to be abolished among civilized people.

Various efforts have been made to do away with war. The

most important step looking in that direction has been taken, in my opinion, by the Inter-Parliamentary Conventions, of which the latest one was held at London on the 22d and 23d of July this year. It was the third of these conferences, if I may count as the first of them the meeting held at Paris, on October 31, 1887, which grew out of an address to the President of the United States, voted in the autumn of that year by 234 members of the House of Commons and 36 of the House of Lords. From this meeting sprang the thought of holding a convention of members of the parliaments of various States at Paris in 1887, the year of the exposition. At this latter convention appeared members of the parliaments of France, England, Belgium, Hungary, Spain, Denmark, Italy, the United States, and even of Liberia. Good work was done by the convention. At London, this summer, all the States mentioned above were represented, and members of the parliaments of Austria, Germany, Holland, Norway and Sweden were present. At the head of the six resolutions unanimously passed was one, in which the convention again urged the making of treaties of arbitration, by which, without interference with their independence or autonomy, the nations will pledge themselves to submit to arbitration the settlement of disputes which may arise between them; but where the making of treaties of arbitration may be difficult at the present time, the convention urged that the disputes be referred to an umpire. And the members of the convention, for their part, pledged themselves, to use their influence, individually and collectively in their respective countries, as well in their respective parliaments as elsewhere, to give practical effect to these views.

The convention had been preceded by two events of great importance. On the fourth of April last the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States passed a concurrent resolution, requesting the President to negotiate with every government with which the United States has diplomatic relations, as opportunity may occur, treaties agreeing to refer disputes between the two countries to arbitration. On the 17th of the same month there met at Washington the Pan-American Congress, which solemnly declared, that the American Republics of the north, the centre, and the south, adopt as a principle of American international law, the settlement by arbitration, of every dispute, conflict or difficulty, which may arise between them.

The convention is to meet next year at Rome, in 1892 at Washington, and thereafter in turn at every other capital.

A movement of opinion, like that of which I have been speaking, will not succeed to-day or to-morrow. It is sufficient, if it does not despair of reaching its goal step by step. Those who believe such a movement a Utopia, have never read history. In 1776, a member of the House of Commons rose, and proposed the abolition of slavery; no voice seconded him, no one voted with him. The motion of Wilberforce was then considered Utopian. The negro, they said, was not only of a different color from a white man, but was not even a human being. On the heads of the poor Utopians were heaped derision, satire and insult. Nevertheless in 1833 England paid one hundred millions of dollars to bring about the Utopia. Now there are no slaves save in uncivilized countries.

I will repeat after Sir Lyon Playfair: "Let us march step by step to make this idea a practical thing. Various factors combine to make peace possible. Commerce, in the time of Queen Elizabeth, was little better than piracy and rapine. Now, navigation and traffic cause different races to mingle together. The nations are gradually abandoning antagonism and substituting in its place friendly relations." And here Playfair gives as an example of this fact, the difference between the relations of France and England now and formerly.

EDUCATION, LITERATURE, AND ART.

EDUCATION AND THE WORKINGMAN.

LEONARD NOBLE.

English Illustrated Magazine, London, September.

MANY who have never doubted the enormous value of higher education when applied to their own individual cases and their own class, will yet question whether we are not running a risk that we are not justified in running, when we offer to the working classes the same advantages, adapted to the peculiarities of their requirements. We often hear it said, that in our grandfathers' times better workmen could be found who could neither read nor write, than it is possible to find now among those who have the advantages of the three R's, and this degeneration is invariably attributed to that broad-backed scapegoat, "Education;" nor is any attempt made to ascertain, whether this falling off may or may not be traced to some entirely different source. Whether education is to the advantage, or the detriment, of the working classes, is a question that the workingman has taken entirely into his own hands by simply saying, "I will have education myself, and will see that my children have it."

It is all very well for those whose time is their own, to say there is nothing very creditable in a man's joining a class at some polytechnic school for one or two evenings during the week. It is sometimes urged that his only alternative to spending his evening in probably a small and crowded room, is to spend it in the public-house. A statement more wide of the mark has rarely been uttered, and only tends to show the speaker's complete ignorance of the nature of the man he is dealing with. The man who is honestly trying to improve his condition and education, is not so utterly destitute of resource in himself, that the public-house is the only recreation open to him during his spare time. He has plenty of other occupations and engagements for his leisure, and is giving up a great deal, when he voluntarily sacrifices one or two of his short evenings during the week to endeavor to improve himself. He knows, however, the value of the sacrifice, makes it coolly and deliberately, and, if he is really the man I am trying to describe, does not shrink from it or think of turning back, but cheerfully smother any regrets that may rise for congenial occupations and pleasures which he has thought fit to relinquish, innocent though they may have been, while probably not improving.

As a rule, most of the men who avail themselves of the working-men's colleges, do so as soon as they have reached the lowest age at which such admission is possible. This is but another proof, if any were required, of their eagerness to better their condition.

Education is no charity, no trifling dole that gives the recipient some temporary enjoyment, or a little luxury that he could very well do without. It means the opening to him of new worlds of thought, expediency and resource. It teaches him to utilize to their fullest whatever capability or genius he may have, in whatever directions they may lie. It shows him how to extend to their fullest his opportunities, his money, and his home, and, above all, how to bring up his children in such a way, that generations unborn may reap the full benefit of his initiatory endeavors. It means the enlargement of all his higher faculties, the fuller appreciation of the beauties, dignity and scope of life, and a larger, broader view of all the questions of the day, coupled with a greater toleration of deficiencies in others. That last quality alone should be sufficient to induce us to extend to the working-man this boon of education, for with toleration may, and probably will, come the strengthening of all the bonds that we cling to, even to the exclusion of others: I mean, that, with gentler

toleration of deficiencies and delinquencies in others, will come love, charity, manliness, pity, tenderness, and all that tends to draw us to a higher life.

M. FRANCISQUE SARCEY.

BRANDER MATTHEWS.

Cosmopolitan, New York, October.

To attempt a portrait of a man of letters, after the subject has already sat to two limners as accomplished as Mr. Henry James and M. Jules Lemaitre, is venturesome, and savors of conceit; but nearly fifteen years have passed since Mr. James made his off-hand thumb-nail sketch of M. Sarcey, and M. Lemaitre's more recent and more elaborate portraiture in pastel was designed for Parisians only. Moreover, Mr. James, though he praises Sarcey, does so with reserve, not to say a little grudgingly; he even echoes the opinion once current in Paris that M. Sarcey is heavy—an opinion which M. Lemaitre denounces and disproves.

M. Sarcey is heavy in body, not in mind. He is portly and thick-set, but not thick-witted. He is short-sighted physically, but no critic has keener insight. His judgments are as solid and as firm-footed as his head. His decisions are serious and elaborate, but expressed, perhaps, with as much liveliness and as much point as any one of the "more alert and lightly armed," critics may display. M. Sarcey's wit is Voltairean in its quality, in its directness and in its ease. Though his arm is strong to smite a cutting blow if need be, yet more often than not it is with the tip of his blade that he punishes his adversary, fighting fairly and breaking through the guard by skill of fence.

And of fighting, M. Sarcey has had his fill since he entered journalism. For seven years after his graduation in 1851, he served as a professor in several small towns, constantly involved in difficulties with the officials of the Second Empire. In 1858 he gave up the desk of the teacher for that of the journalist, and coming up to Paris, by the aid and advice of About, he began to write for *Figaro*. The next year the *Opinion Nationale* was started, and M. Sarcey became its dramatic critic. In 1867 he transferred his services to the *Temps*, which is indisputably the ablest and most dignified of all Parisian newspapers. And to the *Temps* which bears the date of Monday, and which appears on Sunday afternoon, M. Sarcey has contributed now for nearly a quarter of a century a weekly review of the theatres, slowly gaining in authority, until, for a score of years at least, his primacy in Paris as a dramatic critic has been beyond question.

In addition to this hebdomadal essay, M. Sarcey has descended daily into the thick of contemporary polemics. He writes an article nearly every day on the topic of the hour. When About started the *XXIXth Siècle* after the Prussian war, M. Sarcey was his chief editorial contributor, leading a lively campaign against administrative abuses of all kinds, and exposing sharply the blunders of the ecclesiastical propaganda. He has little taste for party politics, which seem to him arid and fruitless, but in the righting of wrongs he is indefatigable, and enters with ardor into the questions of water supply, public sewage, etc.

That M. Sarcey should ever feel any difficulty in filling his allotted space, is inconceivable to those who wonder weekly at his abundance, his variety and his overflowing information. The post of dramatic critic has been held in Paris by many distinguished men, who for the most part regarded it with distaste and as a disagreeable livelihood. M. Sarcey is never faint in his allegiance to the stage, and he is never short of material for examination.

If there are no novelties at the theatres, there may be new books about the stage. Or, if these fail, there are questions of theatrical administration. Or, in default of everything else, the Comédie Française is always open, and in the dull

days of the summer it acts the older plays, the comedies and tragedies of the classical repertory, and in these M. Sarcey finds many a peg on which to hang a disquisition on dramatic æsthetics. I will not say that I have not found the same truth presented more than once in the seven hundred of M. Sarcey's essays that I have read and preserved, or the same moral truth enforced more than once, but that is a pretty poor truth which will not bear more than one repetition.

Perhaps the first remark a regular reader of M. Sarcey's weekly review finds himself making, is that the critic has a profound knowledge of the art of the stage. Of a certainty, the second is to the effect, that the critic very evidently delights in his work, is obviously glad to go to the theatre, and pleased to express his opinion on the play and the performance. No dramatic critic was ever more conscientious than M. Sarcey, none was ever as indefatigable. Often he returns to see a piece a second time before recording his opinion in print, ready to modify his first impression, and quick to note the effect produced on the real public, the broad body of average play-goers, but sparsely represented on first nights.

Next to his enjoyment of his work, and his conscience in the discharge of his duty, the chief characteristic of M. Sarcey is his extraordinary knowledge, his wide acquaintance with the history of the theatre in Greece and Rome and France, his close hold on the thread of dramatic development, and his firm grasp of the vital principles of theatric art. He understands, as no one else, the theory of the drama, the why and the wherefore of every cog-wheel of dramatic mechanism. He seizes the beauty of technical details, and is fond of making this plain to the ordinary play-goer, conscious solely of the result and careless of the means. He has a marvellous faculty of seizing the central situation of a play, and of setting this forth boldly, dwelling on the subsidiary developments of the plot, only in so far as they are needful for the proper exposition of the more important point. By directing all the light on this dominating and culminating situation, the one essential and pregnant part of the piece, M. Sarcey manages to convey to the reader some notion of the effect of the acted play upon the audience, a task far above the calibre of the ordinary theatrical critics. Again, no one knows better than M. Sarcey how sharp the difference is between the play on the stage and the play in the closet, and no one has indicated the distinction with more acumen.

To keep his reputation free from suspicion he refused all honors, even the cross of the Legion of Honor, and declined, after long hesitation, to solicit the succession of Emile Augier in the French Academy. "The authority of the critic lies in the confidence of the public," he wrote; and if the public doubted whether he would speak the truth as frankly after he had become an Academician, his opinion would lose half its weight. He concluded by declaring that his ambition was to have on his tombstone the two words which would sum up his career—

"Professor and Journalist."

SCIENTIFIC.

THE SOCIAL BODY.

E. BENJAMIN ANDREWS, PRESIDENT OF BROWN UNIVERSITY.
Andover Review, Boston, October.

WHAT is man? Mankind, wherein does it essentially consist? This question has been asked and answered thousands of times, yet seems, if possible, actually farther from recognized solution now than when, at Paris, in the morning of the twelfth century, Abelard wrangled over it with his old master, William of Champeaux. The popular anthropology of our time is extremely individualistic, more so than would

have pleased the hardest Nominalist of the Middle Age. To most people "Man" means simply a man—Oakes or Noakes or Stiles or Brown or Thompson. "The human race" signifies these and other individuals viewed collectively. No vital tie is conceived to exist between them. Each is envisaged as complete in, of, and by himself, a final and round-about entity, an entelechy, in Aristotle's phrase. The notion of "man" as a class, is supposed to have arisen by a process of mental abstraction and generalization, after the formulas put down in the old logic books. We notice, so runs this easy explanation, that Oakes and Noakes and Stiles and Brown and Thompson are, in certain particulars, alike. Observation of so many individuals enables us to collect their common traits. This we do, and by a mental fusion of these arrive at our idea of the race as a unit. But it is held that notion is purely subjective, nothing but a creature of our thought. It corresponds to no reality in objective existence. The hard facts in the case are just Oakes and Noakes and Stiles and Brown and Thompson. Their seeming oneness is only a figment of your brain, baseless and volatile.

This atomic theory of man is very old. Plato felt called to enter the lists against it. The Stoics sanctified a phase of it. Among the Scholastics it had a proud career. Our denominational forefathers flew to it in their revolt against Anglicanism in the days of Elizabeth and James. For the dominance of such an anthropology since his day, Locke is more responsible than any other writer. Our American Revolution was fought through under his inspiration. So was the French, for Lockean ideas had wrought even more radically beyond the Channel than in England itself.

Closely associated with this conception of man, as myriad and not monad, have come down to us the theories of a law and state of nature, and of government as originating in contract. The idea of a law of nature, a rule of life discoverable by human insight but superior to human laws, Chrysippus was the first articulately to voice. The law of nature doctrine crossed to Rome and was espoused with avidity by Roman jurists, and from them descended wherever the influence of the civil law penetrated. Canon law took it up. It colored all European literature. Fresh life inspired it when the Reformation had rent Church and Empire, and a new ground of international obligation had to be sought. It was on the basis of natural law that Grotius built his immortal treatise, the "*De Jure Belli ac Pacis*." Pufendorf, Grotius's pupil, named his greatest work "*The law of Nature and of Nations*." During the next two centuries after the Reformation, Buchanan, Hooker, Hobbes, Milton, Sir Harry Vane and Roger Williams breathed air that was literally charged with the natural law sentiment.

I contest atomism as a theory of man. Paschal has somewhere written that "the whole succession of human beings down all the long duration of the ages ought to be considered as one single human being, subsisting always and comprehending continuously." And if you study men, or a group of them, at any given moment, you have to probe never so little beneath the surface, to uncover aims, tendencies, a life entire, which differ *toto calo*, in both compass and kind, from mere generalizations of particular experiences. We are members one of another. Whatever aid the individual may afford us in forming our thought of men as a class, the class notion is equally indispensable to an apprehension of the individual. Nor is this so merely in that things are known by their opposites. It is so because, in a most important sense, the race is one, not as a *compositum* but as a *totum*. The individual, except as parcel and facet of the social body, is a fragment, not a finality.

The social body is like an organism. Its units are so vitally related that, like cells in the animal frame, each is both end and means, at once serving all the rest and receiving service from them. So far from being an accident, a somewhat

which could be dispensed with, yet leaving man man, this mutual giving and taking is fundamental in man's life. Not only are the powers of the individual, as such, incapable of development without a human environment, but even if developed they would be useless, having no scope for application. Man is a political animal. It is not good, but death, for man to be alone.

As for the theories of a law and state of nature, and of government as originating in a contract, no one probably longer believes in a primordial state of nature in the form so dear to Hobbes and Rousseau. Yet nearly the same vagary endures in the doctrine of natural rights, and in a very prevalent manner of distinguishing what is natural in society and government, from what is artificial. The derivation of civil rule from contract—the assumption of a no-government condition, succeeded by government after deliberation—is pure fiction. Every permanent human community, spontaneously and inevitably, claims and exercises more or less authority over its members, forcing each, within certain limits, to obey the collective will. We see this in mining camps, caravans, exploring expeditions and among pirates. Government does not rise out of contract any more than life does, though a particular style of polity may thus begin. Some form of public authority has been exercised, and always will be, however high a degree of moral, social or political advancement may be reached. It is not the wickedness of men, which we hope will in time abate, but the permanent finiteness of their knowledge, that forces us to look upon government as an everlasting institution.

The popular idea of natural rights is perverse. Its vices are chiefly two. It takes these rights, distributively and specifically, as absolute, and it supposes their scope and that of government to be antagonistic, inversely proportional, in fact. I do not admit that any specific right is absolute. The right to property is not. The right to liberty is not. The right to life is not. Either must give way instantly, if opposed to the community's weal. The precious right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience comes under the same rule. Obviously, too, the range of a man's rights may change with the hour and the circumstance. What you are free to do in peace-time you must perhaps forego in war-time. Country people build what and where they will: city people have to ask leave to build at all.

That other so popular view, of a strong and pervasive government as necessarily abridging liberty, is equally false. The precise reverse is true that, paradoxical as it may seem, state power and personal liberty have widened their scope together.

What is the natural and what the reverse? We shall, I firmly believe, find no other tenable definition but this: that the rational is the natural, and the irrational the non-natural. "If we are asked," said Adam Ferguson, "where the state of nature is to be found, we may answer, it is here; and it matters not whether we are understood to speak in the island of Great Britain, at the Cape of Good Hope, or the Straits of Magellan. While this active being (man) is in the train of employing his talents and of operating on the subjects around him, all situations are equally natural. If the palace be unnatural, the cottage is so no less; and the highest refinements of political and moral apprehension are not more artificial in their kind, than the first operations of sentiment and reason."

THE PAST AND FUTURE OF HUMANITY IN THE LIGHT OF THE EVOLUTION THEORY.

LÜDWIG BUCHNER.

Deutsche Revue, Berlin, October.

THE strides made by humanity, both in intellectual and material progress, within the present century, are so enormous and have followed each other in such rapid and unbroken succession, that it is scarcely possible to draw a parallel be-

tween the progress of this and of preceding centuries. It is perhaps not too much to say, that any one of the numerous discoveries, inventions, or demonstrated truths of our age, would have sufficed to confer distinction on any previous century. It is true that few of them taken singly are of such widespread importance to humanity as the discovery of America or the triumph of the Copernican system, and none perhaps comparable in importance with the spiritual emancipation wrought by the Reformation.

But such bright stars in the firmament of human progress during bygone ages, twinkle in isolated splendor, their gleam serving only to intensify the darkness in which they are enshrouded; whereas in the present century every triumph of humanity in any one department serves only to light the way to still more brilliant achievements.

It is perhaps hard to decide which of the achievements of the age may be properly characterized as the most important; but it appears to us that the discovery of the antiquity of man, and of his evolution from lowly conditions, both physical and mental, possesses a significance which is by no means generally appreciated at its true value, but which entitles it to be ranked as the greatest discovery of all times. Professor Schaffhausen was fully justified in his statement, that the discovery of the true origin of man is of such vital consequence to the progress of the race, that future ages will probably regard it as the most important of human achievements; and the German Darwin, Professor Haeckel, enunciates similar sentiments, when he says that the knowledge of the natural origin of man must sooner or later result in elevating the race to a totally different standpoint.

That this origin should have been obscured in absolute darkness in the past was inevitable. It is only by the long and slow process of the evolution of human intelligence, that we could be guided to an elucidation of the truth; nor is it astonishing, that man speculating on his origin, should have subverted the true sequence of events, and pictured a golden, a silver, a bronze, and an iron age, following each other in the order named; that he should have pictured the first parents of the race, as above mortal mould, and attributed subsequent race degradation to the anger of the gods, provoked by man's disobedience to the Divine command. But as a matter of fact the order of evolution of civilization is in the reverse order of the old myths; it is from stone to bronze or copper, and thence to iron, the most valuable and useful of all yet discovered metals, the one to which we owe all the progress of the age.

And although the beginning of the iron age is lost in prehistoric times, both in Asia and Africa, where we find evidence of its use thousands of years before the beginning of our era; it may nevertheless be truly said, that we are only entering on its full development, and that all the progress of the age is more or less attributable to the diversified uses to which this best of all the metals lends itself. At this point the important question suggests itself: Will the iron age perpetuate itself forever, or will it, too, in turn, be supplanted by a metal that shall lend itself to a still higher career of development, facilitating a still greater command and utilization of the forces of nature? It appears to me that we may confidently answer this question in the affirmative, that the metal has already been discovered, and that the glories of the aluminium age will as far transcend the glories of the iron age, as that transcends the achievements of the age of bronze or copper.

The golden age of humanity lies before, and not behind us. In the light of modern discovery, the first fathers of the race present themselves as half beasts, half men, more savage than the savagest beasts of this age, dwelling in trees, or in caves, or in holes in the ground, devouring their prey raw, and with no better weapons than stones to aid them in their warfare with nature. These are conditions which should excite our

admiration and appreciation of the triumphs of civilization. There are those who feel humiliated at the contemplation of man's lowly origin. They would have shaken hands with science, if it had demonstrated that men descended from angels, or from immortals in Paradise. But to me it appears, that the facts as they are, afford the real grounds for pride, and self-gratulation; and that it will be of vast practical benefit to us, if the discovery of the truth reminds us constantly, that the man of culture of to-day is but the last product of a slow process of evolution, in which countless generations have been ever widening the distance between them and their lowly ancestors; and the measure of man's achievements in the past, is an adequate guarantee of boundless progress in the future. Who shall say at what stage of progress we are now standing? We think with pride on our achievements in machinery, in art, in science, in discovery, and our splendid control over nature and her forces, and with right; but who shall say that the people of the coming age will not look back upon the nineteenth century as the dawn of progress; on our boasted triumphs, as the rude essays of the race in the kindergarten of civilization? It may be, that both in moral and material progress, humanity will make such advances, that a comparison with the present, will show a measure in progress, as great as that which separates us from the primeval stock. Such a suggestion may appear to some presumptuous; but when we look at the progress of this last century, when we remember that it advances in progressive ratio, that is to say, that every discovery furnishes the means to further discoveries, we may be prepared to realize that it would be hard to set limits to the possibilities of human achievement. The knowledge of what we are, gives us hope for the future. In the words of Claprede: "Better to have risen from an ape than to have degenerated from an Adam."

THE CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE INSANE.

EDWARD F. WILLOUGHBY, M. D.

Juridical Review (Q'tly.), Edinburgh, July.

IN all questions not admitting of verification by direct experiment, there is in men of different habits or schools of thought, or whose minds are led in one or other direction by education or professional bias, a tendency to run into extremes, to attach undue weight to arguments used on the one side, and to depreciate or ignore those on the other.

In determining how far persons, manifestly or presumably insane, are to be held accountable for the performance of criminal acts, this tendency has unfortunately assumed the form of a chronic feud between the legal and medical professions.

In this neither is wholly without blame, the former ignoring the fact that insanity is as truly a disease of the organs of mind, as dyspepsia is a disease of the organs of digestion, and that there being in each case a plurality of organs with different functions, the structural change and consequent abnormal performance of function may be limited to certain organs, while others may be in a more or less healthy state of nutritive and functional activity; the latter exaggerating the importance of the existence of disease in one part, and assuming its influence over every other.

No one who has studied psychology in the light of physiology, of which it is properly a branch, and insanity in the light of psychology, to which it stands in the same relation as pathology does to physiology, can fail to recognize the existence of three forms or types of insanity, corresponding to the tripartite division of the mental powers or functions, into emotions, intellect and will—a moral, an intellectual and a volitional insanity, each of which may be partial or complete, and which may be variously combined.

The error of the lawyers is, to demand proof of *intellectual*

incapacity as proof of all insanity, and that of some physicians, to assume moral irresponsibility, when they have satisfied themselves of the existence of insanity in any form. Some again, following the lead of the French alienists, are given to a needless multiplication of species of insanity, as kleptomania, dipsomania, pyromania, etc., expressions which, however convenient, have no scientific value. The lawyers, unacquainted with the pathological aspects of insanity, and consciously or unconsciously recognizing only the intellectual form, have always sought for one simple test which should be of universal application; and that which at present, in theory at least, rules the courts, is the knowledge of right and wrong, coupled or not, according to circumstances, with the freedom of choice. The lawyers maintain, that if the time-honored test of knowledge of right and wrong be upset in deference to the crotchets of "mad doctors," without proposing one equally precise in its place, the courts will have absolutely nothing to stand on. But the fact is, this test of a knowledge of right and wrong, which they would raise to the position of a settled principle, is but one of a shifting succession of maxims equally false. The doctrines of the lawyers on the subject of insanity, are but the reflections of the medical conclusions of an earlier age, to which they cling tenaciously, lagging behind the progress of science.

From the time of Lyttleton to Lord Mansfield, which may be characterized as the demoniacal period, the plea of insanity was not allowed under any circumstances. From the latter to the opening of the nineteenth century, which may be characterized as the wild beast period, the criminal was allowed to plead insanity, if it could be shown on his behalf that he was *utterly bereft of reason, and no more accountable for his acts than a brute.*

The test of knowledge of right and wrong is based on the rulings of the present century, the rule laid down by all the judges with one exception, in response to the questions of the House of Lords in 1843, being, that "To establish a defense on the ground of insanity, it must be clearly proved, that at the time of committing the act, the party accused was laboring under such a defect of reason from disease of the mind, that he did not know the nature and quality of the act he was doing, or if he did know it, as not to know it was wrong."

But the fact is, as Mr. W. Ribton wrote: *A man may be mad, and yet know what he is doing. A man may be mad, and yet know that in doing a particular act he is doing wrong.*

On the other hand, commission of an offense in the absence of adequate motive, is no sufficient evidence of insanity. From Nero and Domitian of old, to Charleroi and many obscure wretches in our day, there are instances of a positive enjoyment of wickedness, a pleasure in cruelty, producing crimes, the unheard barbarity of which, as argued by Dr. Casper, the renowned medical jurist of Germany, has only too frequently led to the erroneous assumption of an irresponsible mental condition in the perpetrators, whereas there was in them nothing else than the highest and most devilish development of the criminal nature.

At present, the actual practice of the courts is inconsistent with itself, requiring the jury to be instructed in the new medical theories by the experts, and in the old medical notions by the judge. The consequent predicament is one that cannot long be tolerated. Would it not be at once more dignified to abandon an equivocal, and, were the issues less grave, we might say ludicrous, position? The alleged danger of such a concession to medical science is unreal, for when a man is adjudged upon the evidence to be insane, his irresponsibility does not entitle him to be set free. A judgment of insanity should confine a man, if not for life, at least until such time as he may give satisfactory evidence of a complete and probably permanent recovery.

MUTUAL AID AMONG ANIMALS.

PRINCE KROPOTKIN.

Nineteenth Century, London, September.

WHILE Darwin was using the term "struggle for existence", in its narrow sense, for his special purpose, he warned his followers of committing the error of overrating its narrow meaning. He pointed out how in numberless animal societies, the struggle between separate individuals for the means of existence disappears, how *struggle* is replaced by *coöperation*, and how that substitution results in the development of intellectual and moral faculties, which secure to the species the best conditions for survival. He intimated that in such cases, the fittest are not the physically strongest, nor the cunningest, but those who learn to combine so as mutually to support each other, strong and weak alike, for the welfare of the community. It happened with Darwin's theory, as it always happens with theories having any bearing upon human relations. Instead of widening it according to his hints, his followers narrowed it still more. And while Herbert Spencer attempted to widen the inquiry into that great question "who are the fittest," the numberless followers of Darwin made modern literature resound with the war cry of *war to the vanquished*, as if it were the last word of modern biology.

This view has as little claim to acceptance as a scientific deduction, as the opposite view of Rousseau, who saw in nature, only love, peace and harmony, destroyed by the accession of man.

As soon as we study animals—not in laboratories and museums only, but in the forest and the prairie, in the steppe and the mountains—we at once perceive, that though there is an immense amount of warfare and extermination going on, there is at the same time as much, if not more, of mutual support, mutual defence, mutual aid, amidst animals belonging to the same species, or, at least, to the same family. Sociability is as much a law of nature as mutual struggle. If we question nature "who are the fittest: those who are continually at war with each other, or those who support one another?" we at once see that those animals which acquire habits of mutual aid are undoubtedly the fittest. Professor Kessler, late Dean of the University at St. Petersburg, emphasized this view very strongly, and his view found general acceptance among Russian zoölogists. This is probably due to the fact, that nearly all of them have had opportunities of studying the animal world in the wild, uninhabited regions of East Russia and Northern Asia; and it is impossible to study this region without being brought to the same ideas. I recollect myself the impression produced on me by the animal world of Siberia, when I explored the Vitim regions in the company of so accomplished a zoölogist as my friend Polyakoff was. We were both under the fresh impression of the *Origin of Species*, but we vainly looked for the keen competition between animals of the same species, which the reading of Darwin's work had prepared us to expect. We saw plenty of adaptations for struggling, very often in common, against the adverse circumstances of climate, or against various enemies, and Polyakoff wrote many a good page upon the mutual dependency of carnivora, ruminants and rodents in their geographical distribution. We witnessed numbers of facts of mutual support, especially during the migration of birds and ruminants, but even in the Amur and Usuri regions, where animal life swarms in abundance, facts of real competition and struggle between higher animals of the same species came very seldom under our notice, though we eagerly searched for them. The same impression appears in the works of most Russian zoölogists.

The first thing that strikes us, as soon as we begin studying the struggle for existence under both its aspects, is the abundance of facts of mutual aid, not only for rearing progeny,

but also for the safety of the individual, and for providing it with necessary food. With many large divisions of the animal kingdom, mutual aid is the rule. Mutual aid is met with even among the lowest animals, and we must be prepared to learn some day from the students of microscopical pond life most wonderful facts of mutual aid, even from the life of micro-organisms. Beetles and other creatures, which ordinarily live solitary lives, combine their intelligences in a friendly way for the achievement of purposes beyond the capacity of the individual; and in 1882, at the Brighton Aquarium, I was struck with the extent of mutual assistance which the clumsy big Mollusca Crabs (*Limulus*) are capable of bestowing on a fellow in time of need. One of them had fallen on its back in a corner of the tank where an iron bar prevented its return to its natural position. Its companions came to the rescue, and relieved each other two by two, and their efforts were sustained during the two hours that we stayed in the Aquarium.

When we take up the study of animal life by a systematic course of careful observation, it is seen that the war of each against all is not the law of nature. Mutual aid is as much a law of nature as mutual struggle and that law will become still more apparent, after analyzing the numerous associations of ants, bees, birds and mammalian species of social habits.

RELIGIOUS.

OLD LIGHTS AND NEW.

A COMMENT ON DR. HUXLEY'S ARTICLE ENTITLED "THE LIGHTS OF THE CHURCH AND THE LIGHT OF SCIENCE."*

SIR J. WILLIAM DAWSON, LL.D.

Magazine of Christian Literature, New York, October.

DR. HUXLEY may fall somewhat short of infallibility as an exegetist of Holy Scripture, but he rests his judgment in this as in other matters, on common sense and scientific methods of reasoning; and his views demand respect, not only on their own account, but as expressing those of a large and probably increasing number of educated men and women, and as likely to exert a wide influence in the formation of opinion. I cannot, however, accept his estimate of the scientific value of the so-called higher criticism, of which Robertson Smith, in England, and Wellhausen, in Germany, may be taken as advanced exponents. Their methods are not inductive, but rather analogical and speculative, while it is their habit to build the most stupendous conclusions on the smallest possible basis of fact, or even of plausible conjecture.

I agree with Dr. Huxley, that Bible statements as to nature and history are to be interpreted just as we would interpret those in any other book; and I also agree, that if the historical trustworthiness of the Hebrew Scriptures can be disproved, the New Testament must fall with them. On the other hand, the unique character and magnificent literary structure of these venerable records, and the inestimable benefits they have conferred and are conferring on mankind, should protect them from captious and unfair treatment, and from being put upon the rack of a cruel and harsh criticism, with the view of extracting from them unfounded confessions of guilt.

Huxley declines to consider the question of inspiration, and is entitled to do so from the standpoint of an agnostic. However, after the vindication of the essential truth of the statements of the Bible to nature and history, it may, as he admits, be "worth while" for even an agnostic to look into the evidence of inspiration; and any such good intention on his part should be encouraged, in the interest of truth and fair play. But he should beware of substituting dogmas of his own for those of "ecclesiasticism."

The leading topic of the paper under consideration is the

* THE LITERARY DIGEST, August 2, page 408.

narrative of the deluge as given in Genesis; but he brings in incidentally some other portions of Bible history, and among them the fate of Lot's wife, and Jonah's adventure with the great fish.

The fate of Lot's wife was tragical, and stands as a warning to all backsliders, laggards, and stragglers from the advance of humanity; but it is distressing that any one should imagine that the unfortunate woman was subjected to the terrible process of having "the chemical compounds" of her body "converted into sodium chloride." No such statement occurs in Genesis, and I cannot find it in any of the commentators. In a bitumen eruption, such as that to which the sacred writer refers, the destruction of the cities of the plain, the ejection of brine would be a very probable accompaniment, especially in the valley of the Salt Sea; and nothing could be more likely than that many of those who perished should after the event be found covered with saline matter. The word "pillar" is not a good translation of the original word, which should be rendered "heap" or "pile." The record does not say Lot's wife was converted into salt, but that she "became a heap or mound of salt." She was buried beneath one of those mounds of salt or saline weed which according to the book of Deuteronomy (xxix: 23) covered the once fertile plain.

As to the story of Jonah it may be said, that all parts of it harmonize with the miracles of the New Testament, and we have no reason to discard either as incredible, unless we take the ground of refusing to believe in the miraculous on any evidence whatever—an attitude absurdly unscientific, when we consider how vast is the field of natural and spiritual possibilities that lie beyond the limits of our scientific knowledge.

As to the universality of the deluge, the whole question is little more than a useless war of words, having no direct relation to the facts or to the credibility of the narrative. Yet nothing is more certainly known in geology than, that at the close of the later Tertiary or Pleistocene age, the continents of the Northern Hemisphere stood higher and spread their borders more widely than at present. They were tenanted by a very grand and varied mammalian fauna, and it is in this continental age of the later Pleistocene or early modern time, that we find the first unequivocal evidence of the existence of man on various parts of the continents. At the close of this period occurred changes which could not have occupied a very long time, and which led to the extinction of the earliest races of men and many contemporaneous animals. That these changes were, in part, at least, of the nature of submergence, we know from the fact that our present continents are more sunken or less elevated out of the water, and also from the deposit of superficial gravels and other detritus, more recent than the Pleistocene, over their surfaces. The human period of geology is thus separated into two portions by a submergence, which must have been fearfully destructive of human and animal life, and vastly more extensive than that portion of the Noachian deluge which came under the observation of the author or authors of the narrative in Genesis. If, therefore, we suppose that existing men are the descendants of survivors of this terrible catastrophe, there can be no reason to doubt that it might remain in remembrance, and might be the same with the historical deluge recorded in the traditions and early history of so many races of men. At one time it was supposed, that the geological deluge was a much more ancient event than that of Noah, but recent discoveries have gone far towards establishing their identity as to date. Thus geology and archaeology must acknowledge a deluge of wider range geographically, than we could have inferred with any certainty from the narrative of Genesis. These facts, so well known to all workers in Pleistocene geology, are strangely enough not mentioned by Dr. Huxley.

The gradual disappearance of the waters is said to have been impossible. It is claimed they must have rushed seaward in

a furious torrent. This claim seems based on the idea that the foundation for the original narrative was a river inundation in the Mesopotamian plain. This cannot be admitted; but if it were, it would have no weight. River inundations, whether of the Nile or Euphrates, subside inch by inch, not after the manner of mountain torrents. This objection is one more instance of the difficulties gratuitously imported into the history.

The narrator represents the deluge as prevailing a whole year, which would be impossible in the case of a river inundation. He attributes it in part, at least, to the "great deep"—that is, the ocean; and he represents the ark as drifting inland or toward the north. Such conditions can be satisfied only by a supposition of a subsidence of the land, similar to the great post-glacial flood of geology. In that case the recession of the waters would probably be gradual but intermittent, "going and returning," as our ancient narrator has it; but there need not have been any violent debacle.

THE ETHICS OF EVOLUTION.

J. H. HYSLOP.

New Englander and Yale Review, New Haven, September.

A MAN is not necessarily opposed to evolution because he will not join in that optimistic view of it which so many of its apostles would like us to accept. Pessimistic forecasts of its possible influence and tendencies are not false because they are pessimistic. The truth may often have very unwelcome consequences in its wake, and those who revolt against pessimistic fears are as often harboring illusions as their less hopeful opponents. The fact is, and few are more conscious of this than Mr. Huxley, that the doctrine of evolution contains the possibilities of the most tremendous moral consequences of any theory ever proposed by man. We have scarcely yet begun to feel its influence and might realize comparatively little for a hundred years to come, except that history moves more rapidly in decades now than in centuries of the past. As an evidence of its influence, we may adduce its effect upon the minds of four of the leading men of the century, Huxley, Darwin, Spencer, and Carlyle. Its destructive influence is demonstrable in these cases; whether for good or for ill, every one must decide for himself.

The whole difficulty between ethics and evolution originates in a circumstance, not sufficiently considered by either the friends or foes of evolution. This is the long-standing antithesis between the ideas of nature and of God, in connection with the doctrine that nature is a creation and a revelation of God. The conception of nature has always been the symbol for that kind of inflexible and unchanging law, which it was difficult, if not impossible, to associate with a free will and intelligence, except by robbing them of all moral character.

As long as the study of nature was neglected, idealism succeeded in minimizing or in keeping out of view the difficulties involved in the contrast between the ideal character of God and the thoroughly unideal character of his creation. But when scientific curiosity could no longer be suppressed, and when evolution came in to consummate our knowledge of nature, a spectacle was revealed in "natural selection," "the struggle for existence," and "the survival of the fittest," that simply paralyzes every mind that has looked upon the administration of nature as a type of infinite wisdom and goodness. The wisdom might be there, but the goodness was not, and in addition to the doubt raised about the existence of God by such facts, the quiet and easy inference drawn from them was, or is likely to be, that man can hardly be bound by any conceptions or laws which the author of nature has not seen fit to embody in his own action. This is the impression which is so fatal to common moral ideals, and which will play such terrible havoc with the ordinary mind, when traditional influences have been eliminated by the general acceptance of evolution.

But I am not invoking the bugbear of consequences in order to refute evolution, for I do not think any remedy can be produced to avoid them, by an attempt to resuscitate metaphysics or theology. Evolution has come to stay, and will modify our ethics, whether we will or no. But it is proper to present the contrast between the struggle for existence, or the right of the strong, and the principle upon which we endeavor to rise above the "laws of nature," and to ask whether evolution, as it is founded upon those laws, can reconstruct ethics, or supply the ideal by which man regulates his moral conduct. If it does not, we can demand, either that the theory be modified, or that it be confessed inadequate to meet the necessities of the problem. The fact is, nature is a Medusa head on which no moralist can look and live, and, although we cannot ignore evolution in ethics, we have only to remark one crucial fact, which effectually assigns that doctrine a secondary place in the determination of moral conduct. Upon this fact I concentrate all the emphasis possible. It is, that the whole of man's moral achievements have been effected by *putting limits to the struggle for existence*. The value and importance of this generalization cannot be exaggerated, and is the most direct refutation of the claim that evolution, as embodied in the "laws of nature", has the first and last word to say in fixing the maxims of ethics. Mr. Huxley has admitted this generalization and stated it very forcibly in one of his essays. Mr. Spencer has made an unconscious admission which comes to the same thing as this generalization. To raise the structure of ethics above everything embodied in the struggle for existence or the conduct of the animal creation, and to condition man's improvement upon the discovery and use of some means to frustrate the terrible operations of such a law, or to limit it, is granting all that the most obstinate opponent could demand, and offers the hopeful prospect of something better than despair or pessimism as the ideal of the future.

The most common error of both the speculative and the ordinary mind is, that it fails to distinguish adequately between the *process* and the *theory* of evolution. The latter aims to formulate the basis, law, or principle, which will explain the series of phenomena represented in the process, and the connection of each unit with every other. But we are not always assured that we have recognized in the theory all that exists in the process. If that be so, the formulated theory is defective, not in its scientific conception of the facts, but in its explanation of them. A theory then, may be partly true and partly false; true in its general determination of the process, but inadequate or false in assuming that the principle behind the process is equal to the functions assigned it. And we may go further and assert, that a theory may be perfectly adequate to the causal explanation of a process, but inadequate in its deduction of moral rules from the principle which serves as a physical explanation of phenomena. This is precisely the prime error of evolutionists in the application of their doctrine to ethics.

CRITERIONS OF CATHOLIC TRUTH.

The Catholic World, New York, October.

AN Italian priest, Canon Salvatore di Bartolo, has written on this subject a book, which has excited wide-spread interest in Europe, and is certain to be fully discussed by the organs of all schools of theology. The work enjoys in the original Italian, in which language it has had two editions, the imprimatur of the Archbishop of Turin, and the writer prints, as well from men in authority as from others distinguished for learning, numerous letters of commendation, the first of which is from the pen of Cardinal Manning.

The author teaches, that in the canonization of saints the Church is, indeed, exercising her sovereign authority, but that

the note of infallibility does not attach to the judgments thus made.

On the vexed and vexing question of the Syllabus, Canon Bartolo takes sides against its infallible authority. Without in the least degree touching its claims to authority of another kind, he affirms its lack of that supreme one. The Pope, he says, has never declared it infallible; the Pontiff himself gave it its right name, a *list* of condemned propositions; it was sent to the bishops by the papal secretary of state and only by order of the Pope, who, it is admitted, cannot delegate his infallibility; and many portions of the Canon Law have received far stronger evidence of papal sanction than the Syllabus, and yet are admitted to be not infallible.

A negative proposition, which our author says is of much importance, is that the common and constant teaching of doctors cannot make law, in the face of solid reasons to the contrary. Besides opinions of theologians, he adduces in support of this the well-known fact, that on the questions of the essential matter of the sacrament of Order, the verbal inspiration of Scripture, and the sinfulness of receiving interest on money lent, the scholastic doctors were once in a common accord, in a sense now just as commonly rejected; but the reasons for departing from the common teaching must, he admits, be truly solid.

On the inspiration of Holy Scripture, Canon Bartolo holds views nearly identical with those of Cardinal Newman; that inspiration extends only to matters of faith and morals, and to whatever else, including facts, has reference to faith and morals. This excludes from inspiration what Cardinal Newman has called *obiter dicta*, words, phrases, and sentences, which do not pertain to faith or morals.

In case of conflict between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities in a matter of mixed jurisdiction, reason corroborated by faith will recognize, the Canon maintains, the distinct domains of the two powers, and will obey the competent authority within the limits of the power belonging to it; such obedience will be paid either to one of the two, or to both, within their respective jurisdictions.

We are in entire accord with Canon Bartolo's demand for liberty from the encroachments of private theologians, setting themselves up as censors of their brethren. The office of theological censor is not given by God to learning, nor to ability, nor to high company; it belongs to constituted authority, and to that alone. All correction, which is not official, must be fraternal, and must display the note of charity as a necessary credential; it can claim no note of supremacy other than that. Nor does this rule apply any the less to meddlers who are right in their opinions, but rather the more. Nothing so ill becomes learned orthodoxy as disregard for the sensibilities of honest, but unenlightened Christians; this may be called the stupidity of learning. To this vicious union of erudition in doctrine and stupidity in teaching, is sometimes joined a cruel contempt for the weaknesses of the little ones of Christ; and this is the criminal pride of learned orthodoxy.

Besides the points here noticed, there is space for the following extract only from the Canon's book:

God has endowed the human soul with activity and with power to seek the truth in the vast field which is the domain of knowledge. When, therefore, man is not face to face with an infallible authority, preserving him from error and presenting truth, the attempt to impose upon him a doctrine in which he does not perceive the truth, is to commit an assault upon a work of God, man's actual spirit. The Church respects the freedom of the human soul, not only in those sciences which are outside the domain of theology, but also in theology itself. She does so, for the reason that she will not offer the least violence to the nature of man's soul, and because she has need of the labors of theologians, which prepare the way for the doctrinal definitions, which she makes as occasion demands.

MISCELLANEOUS.

PAWTUCKET AND THE SLATER CENTENNIAL.

THE REV. MASSENA GOODRICH.

New England Magazine, Boston, October.

THE city of Pawtucket lies on both sides of the Blackstone River. It was originally settled by Mr. Jenks in 1655. His father was an iron-worker in Lynn, and fearing that the charcoal forests in that neighborhood would soon become exhausted, the son removed to the Providence Plantations, the estate of Roger Williams, on the Providence bank of the river. He speedily built a forge just below the lower falls, and began operations in the manufacture of iron. He was the father of a large family, four of them sons, who all rose to distinction. The father and his energetic sons gathered around them a little band of industrious men, and established a hamlet on the western side of the river.

The Revolutionary war introduced a new branch of business at Pawtucket. At the very beginning of the war, Stephen Jenks, a lineal descendant of the original settler, manufactured muskets. After the war, anchors and other heavy articles were made; trip hammers run by water power were in vogue, and Pawtucket became famous for its iron manufactures.

But no sooner had iron become king, than a rival monarch challenged ascendancy. Samuel Slater came to the hamlet in 1789 to establish a cotton mill, and from the next year his fame and that of Pawtucket were inseparable. He was not an inventor, yet he conferred as substantial a boon on the United States as though he had devised some wonderful implement. The British were determined to hold America in industrial vassalage, and her laws, threatening fine and imprisonment, forbade any artisan, inventor or manufacturer to send abroad any machine, model or device, that could enlighten others as to any branch of British industry. American capitalists were meanwhile very anxious to introduce the spinning of cotton by power into our land. States proffered bounties, advertisements invited artisans to seek our shores. In vain for a time. Great Britain maintained her embargo. Inventors and artisans trying to embark for our shores were arrested, their models confiscated, themselves thrown into prison. But Samuel Slater foiled the restrictive acts, landed on our shores, reproduced the Arkwright machinery, and became in the words of President Jackson, the father of American manufactures.

Most people know the salient points of Slater's history. He was born at Belper, in England. At fourteen years of age he was bound as an apprentice to Jedediah Strutt, a manufacturer of cotton machinery at Milford. Strutt was a partner of Sir Richard Arkwright for several years, and young Slater had, therefore, an opportunity to master the details of the construction of the cotton machinery then used in England. To perfect his skill, indeed, he served as general overseer, not only in making machinery, but in the manufacturing department of Strutt's establishment. Already he had dreams of emigration. He learned from an American paper that fell into his hands of the bounties offered in our land, and he laid up, in a retentive memory, every detail of the business in which he had been trained. He knew the risk of being detected with any model or drawing and, therefore, took not a line that could betray his purpose. Almost by stealth he left England in 1789, and reached New York within a couple of months. In New York he learnt that Moses Brown in Providence was making efforts to spin cotton, and the young immigrant quickly wrote to him. "I flatter myself," he wrote, "that in the business of cotton-spinning I can give the greatest satisfaction, in making machinery, and

that is made in England." Slater in reply was invited to come and perfect Almy & Brown's little work, and have both the credit and advantage of perfecting the first water mill in America; and a few days later he was in Pawtucket.

"When Samuel saw the old machines," says Mr. Brown, "he felt down-hearted, shook his head, and said: 'These will not do; they are good for nothing in their present condition; nor can they be made to answer.'" He was not the only disappointed one. The worthy Quaker's spirit rose to the occasion, and he reminded Slater of what he had written in his letter: "Thee said thee could make the machinery; why not do it." Proposals were agreed to, and, "Under these proposals," said the confident youth, "if I do not make as good yarn as they do in England, I will have nothing for my services, but will throw the whole I have attempted over the bridge."

Yet how small a circumstance may blight the fondest anticipation! The machinery was completed, but when the power was applied to the machines, it was found that the rolls of cotton would not drop from the cards, but clung fondly to them. Slater was amazed. Half in despair, he dreaded reproach as a mere adventurer and arrant knave, and even thought of running away; but Sylvanus Brown, with whom he was living, dissuaded him from the rash step. He asked, "Have you ever seen one of these carders work in your own country?" "Yes," was the prompt reply. "Then it can be made to work here."

Slater had obtained his cards from Worcester from a reliable manufacturer. It was about dinner time when the unwelcome experience occurred. Mr. Brown went to his house, saw a pair of hand cards that his wife had been using lying on the table and took them up to examine them. He discovered as he did so that the teeth were bent at a different angle from those in the machines, and the thought occurred, perhaps if those cards be tilted a little they will work. On returning to the shop he inserted a thin bit of wood beneath the card, and the difficulty was obviated.

A new era had now opened for New England and America. Slater had reproduced the Arkwright patents. The avarice of Great Britain was thwarted. That adventurous, self-reliant youth, who for eight years, in his native land, had been burning into his memory the details of cotton-spinning by power, had transplanted to the New World an industry which had made other nations tributary to Britain.

This is the Slater whose centenary has just been celebrated.

NEW MONEYS OF LINCOLN'S ADMINISTRATION.

L. E. CHITTENDEN.

Harper's Monthly, New York, October.

THE generation which elected President Lincoln had known only two kinds of money—the notes of the State banks and the coins authorized by Congress. There were many varieties of the State bank-notes, variable in appearance as in value. The policy of Secretary Chase destroyed the circulation of the State bank-notes, and substituted for them the notes of the national banks, under which the holder was absolutely secured against loss. The necessities of war created several new kinds of paper money, and in some cases invented new names for them, such as "demand notes," "seven-thirties," "postage currency," "fractional currency," and finally "legal tenders," popularly known as "greenbacks."

The "Treasury notes," authorized by statutes in force on the 4th of March, 1861, did not circulate as money. They bore interest at the rate of six per cent., were payable one year after date, and issued in denominations of not less than fifty dollars.

"Demand Notes" were Treasury notes, authorized to be issued by Act of Congress of July 17th, 1861, to the amount of fifty—afterward increased to sixty—millions of dollars, in

in making yarn either for stockings or twist, as good as any denominations of not less than ten dollars, payable on demand without interest. In August a supplemental act was passed authorizing the issue in denominations as low as five dollars. The passage of the legal tender act of February 25th, 1862, which required the payment of duties in coin, made it necessary to redeem and cancel the demand notes. Their issue began in October, 1861, and their redemption in the following March. On the 31st of May, 1890, however, there were still outstanding unredeemed of these notes \$56,445.00, or about one-tenth of one per cent. of the issue.

"Seven-thirties" were Treasury notes, authorized by the Act of July 17th, 1861, payable three years from their date, and bearing interest at the rate of seven and three-tenths per cent. per annum, equal to two cents a day on \$100. It was hoped these notes might have some circulation as currency, but that hope was not realized.

"Postage currency" grew out of a device of General Francis E. Spinner, Treasurer of the United States, who, finding that small silver coins had disappeared from circulation, arranged with the Post-office Department to redeem in unused stamps such postage stamps as might be used for currency. This postage currency became so popular that in place of pasting stamps on a piece of paper, plates were engraved for each denomination in imitation of those manufactured by pasting stamps on paper. This postage currency became troublesome to the Post-office Department, and the Secretary decided to take the currency into the Treasury.

"Fractional currency" was accordingly issued by the Act of March 3, 1863, authorizing the Treasury to issue "fractional notes" of any denomination thought expedient, less than a dollar. The whole amount of this currency issued, including the reissues in the place of worn and mutilated notes, has reached the enormous aggregate of \$368,724,079.45. An Act of June 21, 1879, provided for the redemption of the fractional currency then outstanding and for its destruction. Yet on the 31st of May, 1890, there was still outstanding and unredeemed of this currency \$6,912,010.97. Of this amount it is safe to assume that \$4,838,407 has been so far lost that it will never be presented for redemption. If the public convenience were alone in question, there would be a reissue of the fractional currency. It was, and would still be, universally preferred to small silver coins.

"Greenbacks" are the well-known legal tender notes, which are the naked promises of the United States to pay the bearer a certain number of dollars, unsecured except by the national credit, without date or time of payment, and which for all ordinary purposes are money, equal to the gold and silver coins authorized by law. The name "greenbacks" was given to these notes by the soldiers, the backs of the notes having been printed with a green ink patented by the bank-note companies and claimed by them, to be a protection against photography, to be difficult to erase, and to consist of a composition, the secret of which was unknown to the criminal classes. The largest amount of greenbacks outstanding at one time was on the 3d of February, 1864, when the aggregate reached was \$449,479,222, or within a little more than half a million of the full amount authorized. By Act of April 12, 1866, Congress authorized the Secretary to begin the withdrawal of greenbacks from circulation. This withdrawal was continued gradually for about two years, when it was seen that the trade of the country was becoming crippled thereby, and Congress, by Act of February 4th, 1868, suspended further withdrawal. It is accurate enough for all practical purposes to say, that since the Act of 1868, a term of more than twenty-two years of peace, the amount of legal tender notes in circulation has been \$356,000,000.

If the Republic shall again be involved in war there are many facts in the history of the currency issues here briefly described which will be useful to its Financial Minister.

Books.

THE WIDER HOPE. Essays on Future Punishment by Archdeacon F. W. Farrar, D.D., and other writers, with a Prefatory Note by James Hogg. 12mo, pp. 436. E. P. Dutton & Co., New York. 1890.

[This work is a collection of controversial essays, written from time to time by Archdeacon Farrar and other authors of note, with reference to *Eternal Hope*, the well-known book in which Dr. Farrar some years ago expressed his dissent from certain prevailing opinions with regard to the Future Life. At the commencement of the volume is an essay written by Thomas de Quincy in 1852, *On the Supposed Scriptural Expression for Eternity*. The volume closes with a bibliographical appendix, composed of eschatological extracts from the Catalogue of the Library of the British Museum and from *Poole's Index to Periodical Literature*. In the following summary no place is given to more than one expression of opinion on each of the questions raised, save in a few exceptional cases, in which writers whose views are identical have adopted forms of expression which, though different, are equally striking or original.]

There are two questions relating to the future punishment of human souls which, though connected with, are distinct from, each other, namely, *first*, whether future punishment will be eternal or not, and, *secondly*, whether the ultimate destiny of the soul is or is not decided as soon as it leaves the body.

First, as regards the duration of punishment.

The Reverend William Arthur finds by experience that a system of rewards and punishments forms part of God's government of this world. For guidance on the question whether such a system is included or not in God's government of the world beyond the grave we ought, Mr. Arthur thinks, to

Turn . . . to the palmary instance of Holy Writ—the procedure in the case of angels . . . to the cardinal fact there revealed that a younger race and an elder, the first inhabiting only this world though destined for another, the second inhabiting another world though conversant with this, the one consisting of spirits housed in flesh, the other consisting of spirits not so housed, act and react one upon the other, and are, as to government, dealt with on common principles by a common Ruler.

The Reverend Professor Salmon, D.D., argues on the same side that, as vice and misery go together, we must believe either that the vicious will be eternally unhappy or that they are not immortal; but if the vicious are not immortal then we must believe that the good also are not immortal, because we are not warranted in dividing the human race into two essentially different species, one immortal, and the other not. Reason, therefore, compels us either to believe in eternal punishment or to deny the immortality of the human soul. Revelation teaches us to believe in both.

The substitutes proposed for the doctrine of eternal punishment are (1) Universalism, or the belief that all men will ultimately be saved, and (2) Annihilationism (also called Conditional Immortality), or the belief that after a finite amount of retributive punishment the wicked will be destroyed. Dr. Farrar and many of his supporters do not formally accept either alternative.

To Universalism, the first of the substitutes for the dogma of eternal punishment, the Reverend Richard F. Littledale, D.C.L., opposes

The metaphysical objection that it militates against the existence of free-will, and the consequent possibility of a volition of evil through eternity, . . . and the moral objection that it fails to realize the true nature and effects of sin.

The moral objection is left unanswered, but to the metaphysical objection the Reverend Professor Mayor replies that

It is within the power of God to present to the mind such constraining motives as infallibly to engage man's will on the side of right.

The Very Reverend E. H. Plumptre, D.D., Dean of Wells, acts as an arbitrator between the Universalists and their opponents. In his opinion

The thought of an universal restoration is compatible with the belief in a finite grades of capacity for knowing God, yet more so with infinite variations in the effect produced on each separate consciousness by the memory of its own past; and thus as this life is a probation for the next stage of our being, that, in its turn, may be a trial-time also, and the "lowest place" will differ from the highest, as the result of the total aggregate of the past; and so, strange as the paradox may seem, the belief in an universal restoration is compatible with a belief also in the eternity of punishment.

Mr. Francis Peak proposes another compromise. He thinks that universal restoration in the next world will be the result of metempsychosis on earth, because

There is nothing inconsistent with natural or revealed religion in the idea . . . that, not in another sphere, not as spirits only, but by re-incarnation in this very world, those who have failed in past lives may, again and again if need be, return to undergo æonian punishment on earth, till the Gospel reaches their hearts and sets them free forever.

Against Annihilationism, the other substitute for the doctrine of eternal punishment, Dr. R. F. Littledale argues that it virtually accuses God of retrograde action, of reversing the process of creation; but the Annihilationists urge several arguments in support of their theory.

De Quincy points out with emphasis that the words *eternal* and *everlasting* in the English version of the New Testament are incorrect translations of the word *αἰώνιος*, *aiōnios*, in the Greek text; and he argues that evil cannot possibly exist forever because it is, *ex hypothesi*, alienated from God, a Being apart from whom there is no eternity.

The Reverend Edward White advances the biological theory that it is

The height of absurdity to maintain that the vital principle of every human germ . . . which reaches some undefined point of development *must live as long as the Creator Himself*.

Mr. White adds that this dictum of science is confirmed by Revelation; for he regards the scheme of Redemption as consisting of these three simple propositions: Although (1) man in his natural—his present fallen—state is mortal, yet (2) through the action of grace, which is above the law of his nature, he may become immortal by spiritual union with God in Christ, but (3) if he does not become the subject of that supernatural action of grace he, as a natural consequence, eventually ceases to be. Thus, Mr. White argues, cessation of being, which is popularly misnamed "annihilation," is, according to both Science and Revelation, the ultimate destiny of impenitent men.

The argument, briefly stated, of most of those objectors to eternal punishment who do not propose any alternative theory, is that eternal punishment is inequitable, but Dr. Littledale reasons at some length. He urges not only that the Greek term *αἰώνιος* is ambiguous, but

That there are several Greek words . . . whose meaning of "endless" cannot be disputed and which not only might, but almost certainly would, have been used, had the Apostles and evangelists designed to enforce that idea. Such are . . . *ἀπέραντος*, *ἀθάνατος*, *ἀπαστος*, *ἀέναντος*, *ἀπειρος*.

He then points out that in every man there is good as well as evil, and that the dogma of eternal punishment implies that God at least permits, if he does not force, the good to be overpowered by the evil in contact with it. He goes on to argue that if the dogma be true,

Then Christ has been completely defeated by Satan in the contest for the souls of men, since incomparably the larger spoils of battle rest with the latter; and the incarnation has not affected the ultimate nature and destinies of mankind in general.

Lastly, he proves by an argument resembling a mathematical demonstration, that good and evil cannot be co-eternal.

The difference of the two eternities, hell and heaven, consists in the presence or absence of God. Let us put a for each of these eternities or æons, and θ to denote Him. The assertion of the equality of the two, then, is that $a + \theta = a - \theta$, which can stand only if $\theta = 0$, the postulate of atheism.

Secondly, as regards the time of judgment.

The Reverend James H. Rigg, D.D., is one of many who believe in final judgment immediately after death. Those who hold a different opinion are influenced by a variety of reasons.

Mr. J. Baldwin Brown cannot believe that death can act as a limitation on the love of God in Christ.

Mr. A. J. Beresford Hope's contribution to the discussion is the remark, that the theory of final judgment at the moment of death reduces the General Judgment to an empty "march-past."

Dr. Littledale is of opinion, that death is a mere episode in the one life which is given us to live, partly in this world and partly beyond the grave; he points out that this must have been the belief of the early Christians, because they took, as a matter of course, from Judaism, of which Christianity, historically regarded, is a development, the custom of praying for the dead; and he concludes with the following illustration:

The theology which teaches that man's doom is irreversibly fixed at the moment of death, and that, if he be unrepentant at that particular instant of time, he is lost forever, . . . puts God on a moral level with the devisers of the most savagely malignant revenge known to history—the deed known in Italy as *la gran-vendetta*. This differs from ordinary assassinations in that the murderer does not strike his victim down at any time feasible, but dogs his steps till he finds him fresh from the committal of some sin accounted mortal in Roman Catholic theology, and then slays him before he has had a moment for repentance or confession, so as to insure his damnation as well as his death. When a hired bravo executes this vengeance, he exacts a much higher price than the ordinary tariff for his services. The horror with which we read of such a crime ought to make us all careful, lest we should give our assent to the teaching which predicates it, only on an infinitely vaster scale, of the just and merciful God.

HOLLAND AND ITS PEOPLE. By Edmondo de Amicis.

Translated from the Italian by Caroline Tilton. 484 pp. Crown, 8vo. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1890.

[Holland is a conquest made by man over the sea; it is an artificial country; the Hollanders made it; it exists because the Hollanders preserve it; it will vanish whenever the Hollanders shall abandon it. Who and what the Hollanders are, their past history, their social and political life, their conquests over nature, their triumphs in arms and art, the character of the country they have wrested from the ocean, the cities they have built on it, are here depicted, as seen through the eyes of a sympathetic Italian traveller.]

Holland is in great part lower than the level of the sea; consequently everywhere that the coast is not defended by sand banks it has to be protected by dykes. If these interminable bulwarks of earth, granite, and wood, were not there to attest the indomitable courage and perseverance of the Hollanders, it would not be believed that the hand of man could have accomplished such a work. Without timber or stone, her coast is defended in places by granite dykes which descend more than sixty meters below the sea, and by rows of piles sustained by masses of granite. From the mouths of the Ems to those of the Scheldt, Holland is an impenetrable fortress, of whose immense bastions the mills are the towers, the cataracts are the gates, the islands the advanced forts; and, like a true fortress, it shows to its enemy, the sea, only the tops of its bell towers and the roofs of its houses, as if in defiance and derision. Holland is a fortress, and her people live as in a fortress on a war-footing with the sea. An army of engineers, directed by the Minister of the Interior, is spread over the country and ordered like an army. An accidental rupture, an inadvertence may cause a flood; the peril is unceasing; the sentinels are at their posts upon their bulwarks; at the first assault of the sea they shout the war cry, and Holland sends men, material and money; but the battle has to be sternly contested, and for fourteen centuries there has been a flood on an average once in seven years; and in some of these floods, scores of thousands of lives have been lost.

But Holland has done more than defend herself against the waters; she has made herself mistress of them, and has used them for her own defense. Should a foreign army invade her territory she has but to open her dykes and unchain the sea and the rivers, as she did against the Romans, against the Spaniards, against the army of Louis XIV., and defend the land cities with her fleet.

Even setting aside the draining of the lakes and the great defensive works, one sees on every side evidences of marvellous industry. The very soil, which is one of the richest in Europe, is the work of men's hands. It is easy to imagine how the conditions of existence must have called into constant activity their distinctive characteristics of firmness and patience, accompanied by a calm and constant courage; and that the consciousness of owing everything to their own strength, must have infused and fortified in them a high sense of dignity, and an indomitable spirit of liberty and independence.

Writing of the scenery along the canal at the Hague, he says:

For a time there was nothing to be seen on the banks but some small peasant houses; then we began to see villas, summer-houses and cottages half hidden among the trees; and in a shady nook some blond lady seated, dressed in white and with a book in her hand; or some stout gentleman, enveloped in a cloud of smoke, bearing the satisfied air of a wealthy merchant. All these villas are painted rose color or blue, and have varnished roofs, terraces supported by columns, little gardens in front and around them, with tiny alleys and walks, miniature gardens, clean, smooth and dainty. Some of the houses are on the edge of the canal, with their feet in the water, which reflects the flowers and vases and shining toys in the windows. Almost all have an inscription over the door—a sort of aphorism of domestic felicity, the formula of its master's philosophy, such as "Peace is Money," "Repose and Pleasure," "My Desires Are Satisfied," etc.

Here and there a handsome black and white cow crouched on the grass, her muzzle projecting over the water, turning her head placidly as the boat glided by. At intervals at our right and left opened small canals, whose high green hedges sent out branches that met overhead, forming an arch of verdure, under which we could see peasants' boats vanishing in the distance. . . . It was a pastoral paradise. . . . A Chinese Arcadia with small surprises, artifices and prettinesses, affecting one like the low sound of voices of invisible people murmuring "We are content."

The author lingered a year in the lowlands, describes in turn every Province of Holland except Limburg and North Brabant, which he did not think it necessary to visit, and when at length he turns his back upon the country and the last windmill marks the confines of Holland and Germany, he tells us:

Something seemed to be moving within the circle of the mighty wings. My heart beat more quickly. I looked again and saw the flags of ships, the tree-bordered canals, the pointed gables of houses, the flower-decked windows, the silver helmets, the living sea, the dunes, the fishermen of Schereningen, Rembrandt, William of Orange, Erasmus, Barents, my friends, and all the most beautiful and noble images of that glorious, modest and austere country; and as I beheld them in reality, I kept my eyes fixed, with a sentiment of respect and tenderness, upon the windmill, until it appeared a black cross through the mist which covered the landscape; and when even that disappeared I felt like one who departs upon a journey from which he shall never return, and sees the face of his last friend grow dim, and vanish on the shore.

LIFE OF DOROTHEA LYNDE DIX. By Francis Tiffany.
pp. 391. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1890.

[This book records the life of a busy woman and philanthropist, who devoted herself untiringly to the service of humanity in a field which she was the first to explore. As one who by her unremitting efforts completely revolutionized in the United States, and, to a great extent, in other countries, the care and management of the insane, especially in State and County institutions, and who performed a most beneficent work in the care of the sick and wounded during the Civil War, the long life of Miss Dix was replete with usefulness.

The author states in the preface that it was with great difficulty that the material for the book was obtained. It was meagre in detail, owing to the exceeding modesty of the woman whose story is here told; as she positively refused to permit anything to be written of her until after her death. In reply to Mrs. Sarah J. Hale, then engaged in writing the "Lives and Characters of Distinguished Women," and to numberless like appeals for facts in regard to her life and work, she wrote:

"I feel it right to say to you frankly, that nothing could be undertaken which would give me more pain and serious annoyance, which would so trespass on my personal rights. . . . My reputation and my services belong to my country. My history and my affections are consecrated to my friends. It will be soon enough when the angel of the last hour shall have arrested my labors to give their history and their results. . . ."

Shortly before her death, however, she gave to her trusted friend and executor, Mr. Horace A. Lamb, of Boston, her full consent that if such remained his final judgment, the papers might be used in the preparation of a memoir of her life and work.]

Dorothea Lynde Dix was born at Hampden, Maine, on April 4, 1802. In her earliest childhood she showed the depth of heart, the invincible will, which in later years broadened to form the strong character of the woman who made the amelioration of the condition of the insane her life-work. Her early years were spent in teaching, but her health failing she resolved upon a voyage to England. She bore with her a letter from Dr. Channing to Mr. William Rathbone, a prosperous merchant of Liverpool and a prominent Unitarian. She arrived at that city worn out by her voyage and almost at the point of death from pulmonary disease. But Mr. and Mrs. Rathbone took her to their beautiful home and ministered to her with a tender and solicitous care which brought her back to comparative health (for she was never physically strong), and led her to speak always of the eighteen months spent under their hospitable roof as "the jubilee year of her life." She returned to this country in the Spring of 1841. By accident she learned of the brutal treatment of the prisoners and pauper insane in the East Cambridge jail. She began at once to personally look into the matter; visiting jails and asylums from Berkshire on the west to Cape Cod on the east, collecting appalling and sickening details. The result of this observation and experience she embodied in a memorial submitted to the Legislature of Massachusetts. It was a most impassioned appeal, bringing out the facts in startling distinctness and showing with how much heart and strength of purpose she espoused the cause of suffering humanity. After much opposition a Bill was passed providing for better accommodations for the insane in Massachusetts. Her life-work now lay clearly before her. State after State was visited by her, and many legislatures memorialized with like success—the establishment of a State asylum was secured, or sufficient money appropriated to enlarge and better the existing accommodations for the insane. At Trenton, New Jersey, her first State asylum was founded, and she spoke of it fondly as her "first-born child." She travelled alone from Nova Scotia to Florida, leaving behind her substantial proofs of her untiring and vigilant devotion to the establishment or reform of asylums, jails, and almshouses. A letter written at the close of the year 1845 to her friend, Mrs. Rathbone of Liverpool, summed up her work in the following words:

"I have travelled more than ten thousand miles in the last three years. Have visited eighteen penitentiaries, three hundred county jails, more than five hundred almshouses, besides hospitals and other places of refuge. I have been so happy as to promote and secure the establishment of six hospitals for the insane, several county poorhouses and several jails on a reformed plan."

The six insane asylums referred to were the Worcester, (Massachusetts,) Asylum, greatly enlarged; the Butler Asylum in Providence, (Rhode Island); the Trenton and Harrisburg Asylums, her own creations; the Utica, (New York,) Asylum, doubled in size; also one in Toronto, Canada West.

The next nine years she carried, in behalf of her reforms, the legislatures of eleven States, and established two entirely new asylums in Halifax, Nova Scotia, and St. John, New Brunswick. In 1848 Miss Dix startled Congress by the presentation of a memorial asking Government aid in her work. Her prayer was for a grant of 12,225,000 acres of land for the relief and support of the indigent insane and the indigent blind, deaf, and dumb of the United States. The Bill, after four years of unremitting labor among the members of both Houses, was finally passed by Congress, but was vetoed by President Pierce on the following grounds, as stated by him:

"If Congress have power to make provision for indigent insane without the limits of this District, it has the same power to provide for the indigent who are not insane, and thus transfer to the care of the Government the charge of all the poor in the United States."

This disastrous termination to her arduous labors was an almost crushing blow, to the woman who had thrown her whole heart and soul into this one supreme and heroic effort. She always bitterly felt that the veto was an illogical and arbitrary act, and a violation of the virtual promises of support which she had received from the President. Exhausted in body and sick at heart, Miss Dix deter-

mined to seek once more the solace of her friends in Liverpool, and sailed early in September, 1854, on the ill-fated *Arctic*, whose return trip ended so tragically. While establishing the asylum at Halifax, she had witnessed a fearful wreck off the reefs of Sable Island, which she calls "the Graveyard of the Ships," and, as her whole soul was filled with a desire to help the suffering and unfortunate, upon her return to Boston and New York she went among her friends soliciting money for life-boats for Sable Island. As a result she sent out to the Governor of Nova Scotia two life-boats, two surf-boats, cars, mortars, ammunition and ropes. The very day after the arrival of the largest life-boat, the *Reliance*, a shipwreck—a frightful one—did occur. The American steamer *Arcadia*, with one hundred and sixty people, was cast upon the reefs, but with the aid of the trusty life-boats all were saved. The first tidings of the behavior of the little fleet were sent to Miss Dix in England. She visited Scotland and found the insane so deplorably cared for, that she went to London and placed the facts so forcibly before the Home Office, that a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into the matter; an inquiry which resulted in thorough reformation in all the asylums of Scotland. She made a tour of the Continent, which was one of triumphal successes. Her audience with the Pope achieved a victory for the insane at Rome, in the building of a new asylum after her own approved plan. In Russia she saw much to approve and nothing to censure in the care of the insane. Her return to the United States, four years before the Civil War, was followed by a continuance of her work for the insane, and during the war, as Superintendent of Women Nurses, she never took a day's furlough. With the close of the war came honorable discharge to soldiers and nurses, but there was none for Miss Dix. She set to work at once to build a monument to the fallen heroes at Hampton, Virginia, on the spot where she had received so many dying messages. She pursued her hospital work until the age of eighty, never relaxing in fidelity. The last five years of her life were spent in the Trenton Asylum, and she died in the arms of her "first-born child."

DRAGON FLIES VS. MOSQUITOES. Can the mosquito pest be mitigated. Studies in the life history of irritating insects, their natural enemies, and artificial checks. By working entomologists, with an introduction by Robt. H. Lamborn, Ph. D. 8vo, 202 pp. With illustrations and copious index. D. Appleton & Co., New York 1890.

[The contents of this volume formed the subject of an article in the September number of *Popular Science Monthly*, which was given to our readers in the Lit. Digest of Sept. 20.]

Mosquitoes and house-flies, says Dr. Robt. H. Lamborn, in his circular to the entomologists of the country, are perhaps the most numerous, widely distributed, and persistent of the creatures that attack the health and comfort of human beings. Scientific investigation favors the belief that tuberculosis and ophthalmia are carried from diseased persons to healthy ones by the house-fly, and German experimenters have shown that serious blood maladies may be transmitted by the mosquito.

Certainly, therefore, any suggestion, however remote, of a means of decreasing the numbers of, or exterminating these pests, should be followed with all possible skill and patience. Now, may we not have in the active, voracious, harmless "mosquito-hawk" an agency for greatly diminishing the numbers of the smaller insects?

Professor Baird's success in producing millions of healthy fish in a few laboratory boxes and jars; the propagation of silkworms by scores of millions from eggs carried half round the world—these and many other similar facts seem to show, that scientific methods have reached a stage, where it is reasonable to hope that a plan may be devised whereby whole tribes of noxious insects may be exterminated, by the artificial multiplication of their innoxious enemies.

While the present one is probably the first systematic attempt to array the Odonata against the Diptera, it is far from being the first time that the method of arraying tribe against tribe, adopted by Cortez in his much-bepraised contest in Mexico, has been adopted with advantage by entomologists.

The brilliant success attending Dr. C. V. Riley's plan of pitting the Coccinellidæ against the Coccidæ, by colonizing the Australian *Vedalia cardinalis* in California, there to attack and exterminate the destructive little insect, the Fluted scale (*Icerya purchasi*), that bid, fair to ruin the orange industry of the Pacific coast, is the most recent example to the point, and grateful Californians will long honor the scientist, and the wise government, that originates and disseminates knowledge of such inestimable value.

The automatic method is, I am convinced, the only one, science, in its present state, designates as likely to finally succeed, in the warfare of extermination that humanity has entered upon against the smaller noxious organisms; and to this end the life history of every animate thing becomes a matter of public importance. If Riley saved the orange orchards of a nation by studying the habits of an inconspicuous beetle, who shall say that any living thing is so remote or so humble as to be unworthy of the gravest study of the wisest minds?

[The general conclusion of the entomologists who contribute to the discussion, is unfavorable to the view that the dragon-fly is adapted to the extermination of the mosquito; but a careful study of the life habits of this little pest gives every reason to hope, that it may be practically exterminated by systematic and concerted measures of irrigation, drainage, the employment of coal oil and electric light, the protection of insectivorous birds, etc., etc. One of the essayists, Henry C. Cook, D.D., recommends the cultivation both of the dragon-flies and spiders, experimentally, as creatures which are now, within certain limits, active in their efforts for the extermination of the mosquito.]

The Press.

POLITICAL.

COMMENT ON THE NEW TARIFF.

N. Y. Press (Rep.), Oct. 6.—To-day, the 6th of October, the new McKinley tariff goes into effect. A tariff for revenue being no longer necessary, the new tariff has been framed to relieve the people from taxation on articles that we use but do not produce, and to plant the seeds of production of articles that we can produce, so as to insure a certain home supply and permanent cheapness to the consumer, who will thus eventually be independent of foreign sources of supply and of all duties on imports whatsoever. The former of these purposes involved an enlargement of the free list, to which the following forty-three classifications of articles were transferred:

Acorns.	Shotgun barrels.
Beeswax.	Sand.
Books in foreign languages, or blind print.	Sugar and molasses, grades.
Braids, plats, laces, etc.	Sulphur ore.
Chicory root.	Sulphuric acid for fertilizing.
Clay.	Tar and pitch.
Coal tar.	Manilla.
Dandelion roots.	Sisal grass.
Feathers and down.	Sunn.
Floor matting.	All other raw vegetable fibres.
Currants.	Grease.
Dates.	Hair.
Jute.	Needles.
Jute butts.	Nut oil.
Orchids.	Opium.
Crude potash.	Ore of nickel.
Chlorate of potash.	Nickel matte.
Nitrate, do.	Tinsel wire.
Sulphate, do.	Tobacco stems.
Hemp seeds.	Turpentine.
Rape seeds.	Briar root or wood.
Bulbs, inedible.	

Many of the changes in the dutiable schedule were designed to increase our production of goods that we produce now, and in particular to improve the quality of our manufacture. But one important duty aims to create an entirely new industry, that of tin plate, of which we imported in our last fiscal year \$20,921,220 worth. It is estimated that to supply this demand at home will employ 40,000 people, though the new duty will only supply about so much of it as would employ 25,000 or 30,000 people.

Increased duties are found in the agricultural schedule, particularly important being those on the following articles, to which are attached the figures of last year's importations:

Horses and mules.....	\$2,937,562
Cattle.....	152,582
Sheep.....	118,444
Other animals.....	367,498
Barley.....	5,629,849
Barley malt.....	161,666
Oatmeal.....	59,300
Wheat.....	112,363
Wheat flour.....	5,049
Butter.....	13,679
Cheese.....	1,295,506
Condensed milk.....	98,395
Beans and peas.....	1,307,702
Eggs.....	2,074,912
Hay.....	1,143,445
Hops.....	1,053,616
Potatoes.....	1,365,898
Oil seeds.....	2,839,057

And the following rough classification of schedules on which duties were raised to induce home production shows the extent of our imports of goods which we are now going to try to produce in this country.

Cotton goods.....	\$29,918,055
Earthenware and glassware.....	14,383,708
Flax.....	2,188,021
Hemp.....	2,341,956
Flax manufactures.....	28,421,279
Wools.....	15,264,083
Woollen manufactures.....	56,584,472
Cotton ties.....	613,170
Hoops.....	573,255
Cutlery.....	2,532,437

The imports mentioned in this article alone amount to \$196,943,622, and in addition to trying to supply a part of this enormous demand with the product of American labor and to have the wages part of this \$196,943,622 paid to American wage earners, the new law encourages and promotes American

industry in dozens of ways, in the same general spirit of devotion to the principle of home production and encouragement of home labor.

N. Y. Evening Post (Ind.), Oct. 2.—The columns of the journal of the carpet industry in this city contain the remarkable statement that the carpet manufacturers of Philadelphia, who represent two-thirds of all the looms in the country, have signed an agreement to shut down 40 per cent. of their looms for one year. They have done this simply because the McKinley Bill has so added to the cost of their raw material that they cannot dispose of their product at a profit. Their market has been curtailed by the advance in price made necessary by the advance in carpet wool. Fewer people can afford to buy carpets. The shrinkage in the demand has been ascertained or estimated as equal to 40 per cent. Of course they have not taken this step with any view of influencing legislation, but simply to save themselves from loss. The legislation is already past and gone, and the carpet-makers have only to adjust their business to it.

N. Y. Tribune (Rep.), Oct. 6.—This will not do, Kin beyond Sea. It is nonsense for your great newspapers to assert that the American tariff is "an unprovoked act of unfriendliness toward Great Britain," as the *London Times* calls it, and yet that it will retard the growth of this country and hasten British "development at the expense of the Union." Either this measure will not benefit Britain at the expense of America, or it is not an act of unfriendliness. Considering that British ranting about this Bill, and protests against it, and talk of retaliatory measures, have been going on for months in a fashion more conspicuous than creditable, one would like to know why Great Britain objects so sorely to a gain at our expense. Candor compels the statement that the world has not detected such self-sacrificing devotion to the welfare of others in British performances hitherto.

Americans all know that British manufacturers and merchants have believed that their trade would suffer sorely from such a tariff as has been enacted. When the same people pretend that they expect great benefits from this Act, they only make themselves ridiculous. But it is due to the truth to say that the Act has been framed and passed in no spirit of unfriendliness toward anybody—toward Great Britain for past unkind acts, nor toward Germany for exclusion of American pork products. Yet it is the judgment of all cool observers that German trade and industry will be cut down far more than British by this enactment. The cheaper woollens and other fabrics which have flooded American markets for years have come mainly from German works, and dispatches now state that Bradford, England, is "already overrun with Germans offering wollen goods at almost any price." But British egotism sees in the Bill only unfriendliness toward Great Britain.

American Grocer, N. Y., Oct. 1.—After a long, weary and bitter contest, Congress has passed a new Tariff Act which goes into effect October 6. The new Bill has been framed in obedience to the will of the majority, as expressed in the fall elections of 1888. The people then declared in favor of a high protective policy, and at the same time for a reduction in the enormous revenue of the Government. It is estimated that the new Tariff Bill will effect a reduction of \$66,000,000 yearly in the customs revenue.

In introducing the new Bill in the House of Representatives, a majority of the Committee on Ways and Means stated:

"This bill is framed in the interest of the people of the United States. It is for the better defense of American homes and American industries. While securing the needed revenue its provisions look alike to the occupations of our own people, their comfort and welfare, to the successful prosecution of industrial enterprises already started, and to the opening of new lines of productions where our conditions and resources will admit. The aim has been to impose

duties upon such foreign products as compete with our own, whether of the soil or the shop and to enlarge the free list wherever this can be done without injury to any American industry or whenever an existing home industry can be helped without detriment to another industry which is equally worthy of the protecting care of the Government."

We accept the statement of motive as set forth by the Committee of Ways and Means, recognizing the wonderful prosperity of the United States under a high tariff.

With this disturbing factor out of the way, with the Silver Coinage Act in force, with Congress adjourned, let us hope a new era of unexampled prosperity will be inaugurated.

Atlanta Journal (Dem.), Oct. 1.—Only three Republican Senators voted against the Conference Tariff Bill yesterday. They were Messrs. Paddock of Nebraska, Pettigrew of South Dakota, and Plumb of Kansas, making an initial alliteration that may perhaps cut a figure in the future contests for Congress in the Western States.

The votes of these three Western Senators is the first move in a break in the Republican ranks of the Western States over a Tariff Bill which clearly taxes agriculture for the aggrandizement of eastern trusts and monopolies. We shall see its extent in the results of the elections for Congressmen in the Western States, shortly to occur.

Minneapolis Journal (Ind.), Oct. 1.—The Tariff Bill, as Senator Pettigrew affirms, has a strong eastern coloring and is mainly promotive of the interests of a group of manufacturers. It takes off \$55,000,000 of revenue from sugar, it is true; but, at the same time, it subsidizes the sugar trust and increases duties on other articles over \$40,000,000, so that the measure is positively without the feature of reduced taxation. The gleam of hope in the Bill is in the Blaine modified reciprocity and retaliatory feature, and in the limited reduction of the sugar tax, and the clauses encouraging the production of domestic sugar. The McKinley tariff makers, however, had nothing to do with these redeeming features of the Bill.

Burlington Hawk-Eye (Rep.), Oct. 2.—Having passed both Houses of Congress and received the signature of the President, the Tariff Bill is now a law. And thus one of the most protracted and bitter contests ever had in Congress over any legislation has come to an issue, that without doubt will give satisfaction to by far the larger number of American citizens, whose number will grow fast after the law is in active operation and its beneficial influence is felt in business as well as in private life.

Cleveland Plain Dealer (Dem.), Oct. 2.—One result of the passage of the Bill will soon make itself apparent. The farmer coming to town to make purchases for his farm or his family, and the mechanic's wife going to the store for her household needs will find that a dollar will not go as far as it did before the anticipated passage of the McKinley Bill cast its baleful shadow upon the "home market." When the farmer finds that he will have to sell more wool to buy a shoddy coat and more wheat to meet current expenses, and the working-man discovers that the purchasing power of his week's wages has diminished instead of increased as promised, each will have an object lesson on the tariff that will be not difficult of comprehension.

Lewiston, Me., Journal (Rep.), Oct. 2.—The good effects of the revised tariff are already visible. New plants for producing tin, lace, and other manufactures are already projected. Home industry is reviving; textile manufacturers are taking heart; labor is in increasing demand; capital is pouring from the other side. The home market is to be supplied from home workers. Mills in England long engaged in supplying American consumers are shutting down. The good results of protection are to be visible in the healthy development of all

sides of American industry from the Maine farm and the Colorado ranch to the Maine manufactory and the western packing house.

In Europe there is less talk of retaliation and more talk of reciprocity. Even Germany seems willing to open her market to American pork, if we will make certain easy concessions, and the Austrians and French are talking reciprocity.

Houston Post (Dem.), Oct. 1.—The tariff "reform" of the Republicans increases the taxation from 47 to 60 per cent. The tariff reform proposed by the Democrats in the Mills Bill would have reduced it from 47 to 42 per cent. Verily there are reformers and reformers.

The Bullionist, London, Sept. 27.—The results which the immutable laws of economy must work out will soon become apparent when the Bill comes into operation. Imports will decrease; ports, railways, and steamers will be less busy; private expenses will rise; the people will have to pay more; salaries and incomes will be insufficient; less will be bought and sold; import merchants and all the ships will become slack; a smaller number of clerks and assistants will be required; cost of production will rise; the duties which are intended to protect one industry will hamper the others; the weaver will have to buy dear yarn, the printer dear cloth, the shirtmaker dear shirting. Competition amongst the manufacturers will compel them to deduct from the wages what they have to pay extra for raw materials; the power of consumption of the people will decrease; work will become scarce; reduced shipping of manufactured goods to America will produce bad times in Europe, and less American produce will be consumed; the reduced imports will check exports, and all farm products and all American export goods will decline in price; less produce will be sent to the ports, and the railways will earn no dividends; the farmers and those engaged in the export industries will be ruined; the mortgages on land and other property will fall in value, and, in order to cover themselves, the banks will be obliged to refuse credits and call in money. Such a state of things cannot fail unfavorably to affect all American securities, and English holders ought to sell while the Americans are yet sanguine respecting the results of their mad economic legislation.

Cleveland Leader (Rep.), Oct. 4.—No revision of the tariff could have been made that would not have worked more or less injury to somebody. Revision on protection lines necessarily enables some people to secure temporarily, while present stocks last, an undue advantage. It necessarily enhances the prices of some articles for a longer period than present stocks will last, as in the case of woollens, for instance. It will take from three to five years, perhaps longer, for American wool growers to so increase their product as to supply the home demand. But that point reached, home competition will make wool as cheap as it ought to be, and woollens as well. Free competition among 65,000,000 of people, with every resource of raw materials, wealth, enterprise and ingenuity, may safely be relied upon to make prices reasonable—as low as they ought to be, consistent with good wages and good living. Within a year nearly all the opportunities above alluded to for finding fault with the new tariff law will no longer exist, and the very few that then remain will not long survive.

New Yorker Staats-Zeitung (Dem.), Oct. 6.—The tariff in most departments of industry lends the strongest support to the monopolization of business by the great capitalists, and under such monopoly the war between labor and capital rages most fiercely. What greater evidence of the truth of this position could we have than the action of the New Jersey silk manufacturers, who have met a considerable advance of customs duty on silk fabrics by a considerable reduction in the wages of their hands. Both

Johnson, Cowdee & Co. of Paterson, N. J., and Silberman & Co. have announced a reduction of wages, thus teaching the protection-loving workmen a lesson in what they may expect from their idol. In the year 1882 a petition, signed by 20,000 persons in Paterson and the neighborhood, was forwarded to Congress praying that august body not to reduce the 60 per cent. protection duty on silk. Congress complied, and three days later every silk factory in Paterson announced a reduction of wages. The McKinley Tariff Bill has now advanced the import duty on silk higher, and a few days after its passage a further reduction of wages is announced. This is fine protection for the working-man.

The Critic, Halifax, N. S., Oct. 3.—While the advent of the McKinley Tariff Bill cannot be regarded as anything but unfortunate for Canada, yet it is not by any means a knock-down blow. The United States is not the only country we can trade with, and who knows but what we may find as profitable a market for our products elsewhere? At any rate the effort will be made, and shortly. No time is being lost in preparing exhibits for the Jamaica Exhibition, and it is probable that the West Indies will, in consequence, become better informed of the products which Canada is able to export, and will become large customers. We do not believe that the McKinley Bill was dictated by any particular ill-feeling towards Canada any more than to any other country. It is simply the carrying out of a party principle and may not exist for very long.

Providence Journal (Rep.), Oct. 2.—The first feeling consequent on the enactment of the new Tariff law will be one of relief in all quarters. There will be relief for the tired members of Congress, the greater portion of whose time for several consecutive years has been given to struggling with one bill and another on the subject. There will be relief among the people at large who have been wearied by long months of watching the contest that, since the present Congress came together, it was certain could have but one ending. There will be relief, more especially also in business circles where the delays and uncertainties of tariff legislation have caused much disturbance and some depression, serving as a discouragement to enterprise and a drag on progress.

Among business men generally there will be indeed something of satisfaction as well as relief, that the struggle in Congress over this question is ended for the present and the law determined for some years to come.

Business men may not and will not be able to develop their industries and trade to the best advantage under the new conditions. But they can now proceed at once to adjust themselves to those conditions as best they can, with the certain knowledge that they are to be the conditions for the present. That state of affairs is, of course, better for business in general than the uncertainty and hesitancy consequent on the continuance of the struggle in Congress, the pulling and hauling of conflicting interests and the fear that the plans of to-day might be upset by the conditions of to-morrow.

There are abundant signs that the people are becoming convinced that such legislation as this, even though it cannot destroy all our home prosperity, will prevent us from making the most of our resources and labors by its taxes on raw materials and its very severe restrictions on all efforts for enlarged markets. It is because of this phase and effect of the law more than anything else that it may be expected in due time to be condemned and rejected by the voters.

Richmond Times (Dem.), Oct. 4.—Mr. Hayes was entirely right in saying that the passage of the McKinley Bill will injure the interests of the country most seriously, and thereby jeopardize the prospects of the Republican party. If the American people shall contentedly submit to the iniquities that will certainly

attend the operation of the new tariff law, and shall continue the party which framed that law, in the control of National affairs, then they are fully prepared to accept supinely any form of tyranny that may be imposed upon them.

Louisville Courier-Journal (Dem.), Oct. 2.—The Democrats may well congratulate themselves upon the shape into which the Republican managers and lobby leaders have placed the tariff issue. From a mere partisan sense the Democrats have reason to regret the work of the winter, but the trouble is that the people will be the sufferers from legislation of this character, and it is always easier to enact than it is to repeal a pernicious tax schedule.

MR. MCKINLEY'S FORLORN HOPE.

Pittsburgh Commercial Gazette (Rep.), Oct. 4.—The Democrats are evidently not so sanguine of their ability to "lay Mr. McKinley out" as they were when they so meanly gerrymandered his district as to change a Republican majority of 4,000 into a Democratic majority of 2,500. The champion of protection has been tendered a unanimous renomination, and notwithstanding the heavy odds against him he has determined to make as hot a fight as he can for his seat. That he will get much assistance from friends and admirers outside the district, and even outside the State, is to be expected. The fact that a subscription has been started in his aid in this city is seized upon by our Democratic contemporaries as evidence of "a boodle campaign," and, according to Democratic methods and interpretation, that means the purchase of votes.

But why should our friends of the opposition cry out so lustily before they are hurt? They surely do not mean to insinuate that every Democrat in ten "has his price," and that a moderately-sized bag of money can change an adverse majority of 2,500 in Mr. McKinley's new district. To believe that would be to lose faith in Democracy, pure and undefiled. Rather let it be considered that the Democrats of the district have nominated a candidate with "a barrel" against the plucky little Republican, who has plenty of fame but no fortune, and that it is necessary to meet boodle with boodle.

N. Y. World (Dem.), Oct. 8. (Millersburg, O., Special, 7.)—Congressman McKinley, wrapped in his gray Inverness cloak, sat this morning in the smoking car of the train which rattled down through the gorgeous Killbuck Valley to this Democratic hot-bed, here to open his campaign. Interrupted only by the frequent greeting of strangers who recognized his clear-cut profile, he drank in the magnificence of the craggy hills, rich in their Autumn colors, and like a man at ease with himself gazed and smoked until, with a jerk, the train halted at this little village, and the best efforts of the village brass band roused him from his reverie.

The prospect of Holmes County going Republican is almost as remote as that of Mr. Flannigan's carrying Texas. There were just 227 Republican votes cast last Fall in this town of 3,000 inhabitants. Naturally, therefore, considerable curiosity prevailed to know how the Major would be received. The welcome proved cordial, and all the afternoon the Congressman stood in the hotel parlor, grasping the faithful and the unconverted by the hand, while his able lieutenants distributed literature with reckless lavishness.

The citizens of the county have never before been treated to a thorough canvass, and the effect of promised visitations from men of National note will be watched with interest. Just now Republican effort is largely concentrated upon the Amish farmers, who are supposed to be holding their wool in anticipation of higher prices on account of the new tariff. These strange people, no less picturesque than their hills and valleys, compose nearly one-third of the population, and as they make almost everything they use, even to clothing,

are chiefly interested in the selling price of their products.

Campaign work has just commenced, and one may now only enjoy the smoke of battle, for the effect cannot be seen.

By sunset the farmers had begun to arrive in town, and at 6.30 o'clock the pretty little town-hall, seating 700, was filled. At a trifle after 7 o'clock the Websterian face of McKinley appeared upon the stage and a vigorous cheer announced the fact. The speech lasted less than an hour and was a simple story of the theory of protection as illustrated by the bill that has just become a law.

"As Burke said of liberty," declared Major McKinley in his most dramatic tone, "Protection is for all or it is for none." Again he said:

"We have given the farmer what he never had before—a distinctive place in the tariff laws. I tell you, without this there was danger ahead. With their cheap lands and their cheaper laborers, it was but a question of time when the wheat of Asia would find a market in the city of New York. We put up the bars before the horse got in. Ours is neither a bill of diplomacy nor a bill of retaliation. The rank and file of the Democratic party are today for protection."

The most telling point made by Mr. McKinley was not an argument but a reminiscence. He read from a Democratic Ohio campaign document issued in 1883, headed "Republican Tariff Tinkering Costs Ohio Flockmasters Six Million Dollars." This document went into details, stating that the farmers of Holmes County, by that reduction, had lost in the depreciated value of their sheep and wools \$71,456.80.

"If you believed in protective tariff then," commented the speaker, "that is your duty now."

The meeting was mildly enthusiastic throughout. To-morrow Mr. McKinley will speak at Wadsworth, a village in the north end of his district.

THE WORK OF CONGRESS.

Charleston News and Courier (Dem.), Oct. 3.—At last the wearisome first session of the 51st Congress has come to an end.

The Congress was in session for ten months, having assembled on Monday, December 2, 1889, and adjourned on October 1, 1890. The Senate had a membership of 82, of which the majority numbered 45 Republicans and the minority 37 Democrats. The House had 330 members, the Republicans according to the official roll of the clerk having a majority of eight. The principal subjects which were expected to occupy the attention of Congress, outside of the regular Appropriation bills, were the Tariff, the Silver question, the Direct Tax Bill, the Blair Education Bill, the Land Grant Forfeiture Bill, the Anti-Trust Bill, the Dependent Pension Bill, the repeal of the Civil Service and Oleomargarine Laws, Irrigation of Arid Lands, Canadian Reciprocity, the Bering Sea seal question, the Mexican and Alaskan boundaries, and the question of foreign control of inter-oceanic canals and railways in any part of the American Continent, and the confirmation of the Samoan treaty. The Republican National platform had promised some measure for the control of Federal elections, but that matter was not generally spoken of when Congress met as among the subjects of probable legislation.

The House was organized on the first day of the session, without noteworthy incident, and it was not until the last week in January that matters began to grow really interesting in the House by reason of the dispute over the rules, the avowed determination of the majority to override the minority, and the stubborn defense of their rights by the Democrats. On the 29th of January Speaker Reed made his infamous ruling that a quorum would be counted, and from that time on the House has been governed by the Republican majority through the committees, and the Republican party is responsible for what has been done.

Eight months of Republican rule under Reed's arbitrary administration—and what has been accomplished? Besides the Appropriation Bills, one can almost count the important measures on his fingers. Last in enactment, but first in importance, is the McKinley Tariff Bill, of which Senator Morgan aptly said, that "the only great leading principle of the bill was higher taxation of the people and greater profits to those engaged in manufacture." As complements to this arbitrary use of the taxing power for the benefit of a special class to the injury of all other classes, may be mentioned the Customs Administrative Bills and the Bill for the classification of worsted cloths as woollen.

Next in importance is undoubtedly the Silver Act, by which the silver problem was temporarily solved in the interest and to the immense profit of the silver kings of the West, raising the value of their product some 25 per cent. in the course of a few months.

The Anti-Trust, Anti-Lottery and Original Package Laws, while each aiming at the accomplishment of a very desirable object, all touch on dangerous ground and tend to the centralization of the Government. The same may be said of the World's Fair Bill.

The Bills for the admission of Idaho and Wyoming were, almost without concealment, passed to add four more to the Republican majority in the Senate.

The Land Grant Forfeiture Bill was so amended that it became at last a measure, the name of which should have been changed to "A Bill to confirm to the great railroad corporations the title to vast areas of land to which otherwise they would have no legal claim whatever."

The other measures of public interest which have become laws may be briefly stated as follows: The Bill recommended by the International Maritime Conference to prevent collisions at sea, and provisions in the Naval Appropriation Bill to add to the new navy three line-of-battle ships, one protected cruiser, one torpedo cruiser and one torpedo boat. For the appointment of an additional Secretary of War and an additional Secretary of the Navy. For the establishment of a National Park on the battle-field of Chancellorsville. For the relief of the Mississippi River Valley flood sufferers. For the exportation of fermented liquors in bond without payment of internal revenue tax. Appropriating \$1,000,000 for the purchase of nickel for the navy. For the erection of a hotel on the Government reservation at Fort Monroe. To prevent the introduction of contagious diseases from one State into another. For the protection of settlers upon Florida phosphate lands.

The mischief that the present Congress has accomplished by revolutionizing the modes of procedure and enacting the McKinley Bill is perhaps only equalled by the mischief it has been prevented from doing by the stubborn resistance of the Democrats, which has at least delayed for one session the passage of the Federal Election Law and the Conger Land Bill, two bills which, like the Tariff Bill, bear with special severity on the South. For this much we may be thankful, but for how long remains to be seen.

Pittsburgh Chronicle-Telegraph (Rep.), Oct. 2.—At six o'clock last night the halcyon and vociferous first session of the Fifty-first Congress came to an end.

What has been accomplished since the session began on the first Monday of December last?

Despite the determined opposition of a very perniciously active minority, which manifested a strong disposition to block legislation which it could not direct, some good work has been done.

The absurd proposition that members could be present in their seats ready to vote when it suited them, and then at will technically absent themselves for the purpose of breaking a quorum, has been relegated to the limbo of parliamentary nonsense. Business methods

of conducting business in Congress have been introduced.

An excellent Tariff Law has been passed, with the reciprocity provision.

Silver has been restored to its rightful position as money.

The number of the States has been increased by the admission of progressive and thoroughly American Territories.

The navy has been materially strengthened. A Customs Administrative law has been passed.

A Meat Inspection Bill has become a law.

The official designation of the first is "An Act to simplify the Laws in relation to the Collection of the Revenues." Its object is chiefly to prevent frauds upon the revenue by importers and foreign consigners of goods, and it requires a very full and formal statement in all invoices or lists of goods shipped to the United States by merchants or manufacturers abroad, giving correctly the value, quality, quantity and measurements of the goods sent. The operation of the measure will save to the country millions of dollars annually.

The Meat Inspection Bill is for the benefit of the vast animal food industry of the United States. It not only removes all reason for these restrictions by providing a guarantee of the wholesomeness of American exported meat, but it will open markets for it hitherto closed, or else close the most profitable market the manufacturers of France, Germany and England have for many of their products.

The session of Congress which has just adjourned has been severely and justly criticised for some things, but it has given the country some greatly needed legislation, and the credit for these benefits belongs to the Republican party.

Chicago Herald (Ind.), Oct. 3.—During the ten months that Congress has been in session it has been chiefly engaged in the consideration of ways and means of conferring unjust privileges upon certain favored interests. Nominally a body representing the people of the United States, it has in fact acted only in behalf of a class.

A congress of the confederated trusts and combines called to consider the best methods of limiting production and increasing prices would not have been more unmindful of the interests of the consumer. The representatives of the people have been silenced exactly as the American Iron and Steel Association or the presidents of the coal roads in solemn conclave for the purpose of devising new schemes of plunder would silence a man who appeared before them to plead the cause of the oppressed. Democratic representatives of the people in this House have been used to fill quorums, but they have not been heard. An interest that has become so powerful that it can destroy commerce and corrupt the ballot does not hesitate to stifle free speech. Such liberties as the minority still retain are held by permission of the ruling class, subject to withdrawal at any moment when they may become dangerous to the new sovereignty.

The most inhuman tyrants that the world has ever known have made a virtue of appealing to the people occasionally. So now we shall see the bullies and the robbers fresh from their Washington infamies making their regular biennial obeisance to the people whom they have oppressed and all but forgotten. The important question is: Will they escape the punishment that they deserve, and, thus reassured, return to their seats to engage in new crimes against mankind?

Atlanta Journal (Dem.), Oct. 3.—One of the most revolutionary sessions of the lower house of Congress ever held—certainly the most revolutionary held in a time of peace—has at last terminated, and a sensation of relief is felt all over the country. It is chiefly and infamously notable from the fact that, as Speaker Reed himself admitted, it was "not a deliberative body." All its important work was cut out in a Republican caucus, and was forced

through the House, with or without a majority vote, by the Speaker, who counted quorums that did not appear on the roll-calls, and refused to recognize members opposed to the passage of measures which he favored.

With all its usurpations, and notwithstanding the absolute rule of the Republican majority, nearly all the work of the session consists of the squandering of the public money and the increase of the taxes of the people.

But the session has closed at last, and the earnest desire of every patriotic citizen must be that "we ne'er may look upon its like again."

Nashville American (Dem.), Oct. 2.—The first session of the Fifty-first Congress ended yesterday, and if it had a soul may the Lord have mercy upon that soul. In its bold disregard of everything constitutional, parliamentary and fair, this Congress has broken all records and written itself down beside no other Congress in history. It has been a hating, malignant, partisan Congress, with venom and virulence in its every action. It has been a corrupt body, condoning political and private crimes, at the same time that it enacted legislation for the general corruption of many classes of citizens. It has been, in addition, a discriminating Congress. It has been the tool of a plutocracy and of the moneyed interests, to build up all around them barriers through which the people could not break. It has legislated for the East against the other sections, and has increased the burdens of taxation until they are almost unbearable.

Too much cannot be written in condemnation of this Congress, and the righting of its iniquities will be the sacred heritage it will bequeath to its successors.

RESIGNED TO AVOID DISMISSAL.

New Yorker Staats-Zeitung (Dem.), Oct. 2.—Wheat, the Postmaster of the House of Representatives, has been deprived of his appointment. It was the concluding business of the House, and by no means an agreeable task for the Republican friends of this modest pupil and follower of Quay, but the evidences were so overwhelmingly clear that the Committee of Ways and Means could not possibly ignore the convincing proofs. The rascal, however, when he found that his fate was sealed had the impudence to hand in his resignation in writing. Pity that so worthy a representative of the Republican conception of the duties and obligations of public office, could simply be deprived of his post. By rights, the scoundrel should have been first cashiered and then sent before the Grand Jury.

THE ISSUE IN WISCONSIN.

Chicago Herald (Ind.), Oct. 6.—It is folly for the true Democrats of Wisconsin to shut their eyes to the importance of the surrender that the Milwaukee demagogues have invited them to make. They may ignore the facts now, but if they do, a time will come when they will be compelled to consider them and to act upon them.

The offensive foreigners who have declared that the Bennett law must go, assert that they are in favor of compulsory education and of the widest instruction in the English language, but they oppose the Bennett law "because it interferes with parental rights." This is mere playing with words. The Bennett law contemplates nothing at all but compulsory education and a reasonable amount of instruction in the English language. It interferes with no parental right. The parent may send his child to any sort of a school that he pleases, so long as it is one in which some portion of the time is devoted to the study of English. Any parent who believes in education and in the English language will never know that there is such a measure as the Bennett law. It will reach all parents who do not believe in education and all parents who do not believe in the English language, and it ought to reach them. If this republic is to endure there must be education,

and if the American people are to remain a nation they must speak and read the language in which their constitution and laws are written.

As at present supported the Democratic State ticket in Wisconsin deserves to be beaten by an overwhelming vote. It is not a fit exponent of democracy. It stands for an obnoxious foreignism. It is an alien, a stranger. It degrades democracy. Democracy should be foremost in pulling it down, before election, if possible, but at the polls, if necessary.

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM.

Chicago News (Ind.), Oct. 3.—In his usual admirable style George William Curtis has again voiced the sentiments of all true Civil Service Reformers at the annual meeting of the National Civil Service Reform League in Boston.

This perennial arraignment of the spoils system in the management of political parties does not seem to trouble the politicians. There strongly obtains a sentiment among that class of ruling officials known as "practical" politicians that Civil Service Reform is one of those theories which are beautiful but utopian. It is gratifying to know that the Civil Service Reform League, of which Mr. Curtis is a shining light and prophet, is making some little headway in disseminating the truth, that Civil Service Reform is not merely a theory but a substantial potentiality of better government.

Of course it was almost ironical for Mr. Curtis to seriously question the extent to which the ruling clique of the Republican party had redeemed their pledges of Civil Service Reform. That there is no good ground for believing that it would be any better under a ruling clique of the Democratic party Mr. Curtis freely concedes. But he cannot refrain from pointing out that rarely has there been such an exhibition of spoils distribution as has characterized the present administration's control of the post-office department.

Is Civil Service Reform, therefore, a dead issue? By no means. In spite of these lapses of "practical" politicians, when they suddenly come into power after being debarred from office for so long, history will record the fact that the seeds of real Civil Service Reform in the American Republic were sown in the closing years of the nineteenth century. However short of adequate accomplishment thus far, the Civil Service Reformers should not be discouraged or relax their efforts. The principles upon which their work is based are steadily growing in the estimation of the American people, and the day cannot be far distant when the very magnitude of the interests involved will compel this Republic to retire the spoilsmen in the interests of pure government.

FOREIGN.

IRISH AFFAIRS—THE FAMINE AND THE RECENT ARRESTS.

The Times, London, Oct. 2.—The fall elections in America are close at hand, and the party bosses and wire pullers of all sorts are diligently cultivating the various interests on which the composition of the new House of Representatives depends. Now that gigantic electioneering job, the McKinley Bill, is out of the way, the astute personages whose trade is to manipulate the electorate of the great republic have turned their attention to the Irish vote. Both parties are keenly alive to the importance of exhibiting their affection for Ireland in the brief interval that remains before the Irish managers march their well-drilled squadrons to the polls, and an ex-President from each lends his name to the American committee for the relief of the famine in Ireland.

Under ordinary circumstances the members of that body might have waited to get some news of the impending calamity from this side of the Atlantic. Britain is a good deal nearer to the congested districts than New York, and

we assure this committee of American politicians and journalists that the famine with which they hope to angle for the Irish vote has not yet been heard of here outside the columns of Mr. Parnell's papers.

Withal, philanthropic Americans, might have learned from their Parnellite papers that there is an executive Government in Ireland that is primarily responsible for the lives of its subjects. The agitators themselves are never weary of dwelling on this fact, and there is awful evidence that the Irish executive is fully alive to the real possibilities of the situation, and is fully able to cope with them as they may arise. The imminence of the elections, however, necessarily overrules considerations of this kind. Alms, to be effective at the polls must be prompt, and, although the Parnellists find December as the earliest period at which the distress will become acute, the American Committee are anxious that dollars be lodged without delay, and that subscriptions be duly trumpeted in the newspapers before the Irish American citizens be called upon to settle whether the Democrats or the Republicans are the true friends of Ireland.

Do Mr. Wilson and his friends soberly imagine they can persuade America that the English people, whose magnificence in all good works is known to the end of the world, would tolerate the shame of seeing their own fellow-citizens suffer hunger unrelieved? Every country in Europe has in turn gratefully owned the help of England's lavish hand—India, China, America, too, have appealed to us in distress. When has any land, cause, or people appealed in vain? Is it to be supposed that to the distress of Ireland alone the charity of Britain is closed? The transparent truth, of course, is that the framers of this impudent, mendacious document are bent, not on charity, but electioneering.

N. Y. Sun, Oct. 6.—On April 23, 1846, the terrible year of starvation for Ireland, the *London Times* made this inhuman reply to the pathetic appeal from across the channel:

"What does the Irish party expect? Is the State to do all, and individuals nothing? Are we, the people of England, to furnish all the money, and the landlords of Ireland to put it in their pockets in the shape of rent? Suppose it to be true that the measures hitherto attempted for the relief of Ireland have not answered the expectations of the country, what does this prove? What but that to feed a starving nation is a task beyond the ordinary power of a government."

Pittsburgh Times, Oct. 4.—Was ever a cause served by its foes as that of Ireland has been in the last few weeks? Look back to the beginning of this period and what will be seen in this country but indifference to the fate of Erin? It engaged only vagrant thoughts either on the streets or in the press. Now, behold the revival, awakened by the enemy.

Dillon and O'Brien announce their purpose to visit the United States to stir up the hearts of their countrymen, but instead of sailing away, they are hauled away to prison. Balfour puts a veto on their mission with a police magistrate's warrant. At once the old fire in the Irish-American bosom bursts forth with consuming heat. The exciting events of the trial added unexpected fuel to it.

As if this were not enough, the *London Times*, smarting still from the disgrace of the Pigott incident and the failure of the assault on Parnell, brings its own special bundle of faggots in the shape of a denunciation of the humane appeal, signed by some of the most illustrious Americans, with no thought of race, politics or creed, in behalf of the hungry mothers and little ones in the stricken parts of Ireland.

Folly could have gone no further. The anger of every Irishman who had a thought for the land of his birth or a spark of esteem for that of his adoption, flashed out at this gratuitous insult to both, and he asked himself what Ireland has to hope for from such a spirit as this.

The inclination, clear as day a few weeks ago, to let Home Rule work out its own sal-

vation, has been lost in the new-born impulse for liberty which owes its origin to the incidents mentioned.

St. Stephen's Review, London, Sept. 27.—I gather from an informant in Ireland that the potato crop, though partially much injured, is in many parts very good. In the hilly districts of the County Down, and other parts of the North, some tenants say they never had a better crop of potatoes, flax is especially good, and oats better than usual in many places. But it is quite true that the small Irish farmers are very bad managers. As long as they think they can get more rent abatements, or a better Land Act, they will not work. In the Isle of Man where the land is not so rich or fertile, the farmers make it pay far better. The large thirty and forty acre fields are often cut down in a few hours by a machine worked by a traction engine, but an Irishman leaves his oats out in the rain until it is spoiled, and then grumbles at having to pay any rent to his ruined landlord.

Detroit Journal, Oct. 4.—The proposed contributions in this country for the Irish famine seem to have been started without consulting the Irish leaders. It is quite possible they may not approve of it. In the last famine of 1880 they declared that they never would again appeal to the American people for aid. They said that the next time they would drive home the responsibility for the famine upon the English people. They would advise the starving people of Ireland to withhold their rents from their landlords and buy food with the money.

There is food enough in Ireland except of the potato. But all this other food goes to the support of the landlord. The tenant must live on the potato. When the potato fails he has nothing to eat; but his landlord gets his share of the crops just the same. If the American people take care of the starving Irishman, he will have no excuse for withholding his money from his landlord. The champions of the "plan of campaign" will have no excuse for advising him to do so. The landlord will be quite well pleased to see the benevolent American relieving him from the responsibility of feeding his starving tenants. In fact, the American will be paying the landlord his rent, and to that scheme he can have no sort of objection.

The Scotsman, Edinburgh, Sept. 26.—It may be taken for granted that nothing will impress the Irish people more strongly than the conviction that the Government are in earnest in their determination to maintain the law, and to punish all those who seek to incite either to the repudiation of just debts or to the practice of intimidation or dishonesty. In all likelihood a good deal will be heard in this case about the folly of attacking Messrs. Dillon and O'Brien at this time. That will be the short-sighted view of those who imagine that Ireland can be governed by the sprinkling of rose-water over the doings of her incendiary patriots. It is part of the business of Messrs. Dillon and O'Brien—and the main part of that business—to do their utmost to convince the Irish people that they are masters of the Government and controllers of Ireland's destinies. If they can show to their fellows that the Government dare not attack them, or that the Government will not attack them, they have gained a great point in their case. It should be remembered that in all such matters contemptuous treatment of an offender is liable to be mistaken; especially if the contemptuous treatment takes the form of silence as to his misdoings. The silence is attributed to fear instead of to policy; and the result is to encourage others to do as the offender has done, and probably worse.

Le Temps, Paris, Sept. 20.—We do not believe, as Mr. Dillon has declared, that Mr. Balfour, wished, by arresting the two Mem-

bers in question, to prevent them from realizing their project of going to the United States, to make a round of addresses and ask help for the Nationalist cause and for the population deprived of its ordinary food. No, the Conservative ministry wished to intimidate the *home rulers*, at the beginning of a season when misery will probably dispose too many towards dangerous excitement. Only Mr. Balfour may possibly be mistaken in his calculations.

Mr. Dillon and Mr. O'Brien are not making acquaintance for the first time with the prisons of Her Majesty. Mr. O'Brien during the last three years has passed fifteen months in jail, and Mr. Dillon five months during the last two years; and neither of them has come out of prison cured of what their fellow-citizens call "their impenitent patriotism."

We may be allowed to doubt, moreover, whether it is very wise, at the moment when famine throws its menacing shadow over Ireland, to offer the country, in the form of assistance, the imprisonment of men whom the Irish regard as their most ardent defenders.

THE MANŒUVRES OF THE GERMAN FLEET.

Vossische Zeitung, Hamburg, Sept. 12.—The purpose of the very expensive and still more fatiguing manœuvres of the German fleet, Sept. 8-10, along the eastern coast of Schleswig, is principally political. It is well known that one of the main features of the French plan of attack in 1870 consisted in the descent of the French fleet upon the Pommeranian coast, the disembarkment of a complete army-corps, and a straight march upon Berlin. The scheme, however, could not be carried through without a close alliance with Denmark, and the French diplomacy failed to entrap the Danes. But though foiled at that time, it has never been given up. It will be remembered that Mr. Rope in his sensational pamphlet, *Berlin et Rome*, which appeared in Paris a few years ago, and which was believed to have been inspired from the very highest sources, gave a detailed demonstration of how such an attack could be made, not only upon Berlin from Stettin, but also upon Rome from Civita Vecchia, and there can be no doubt that it is the knowledge of the existence of this plan which has impelled the German government to strain every nerve in order to develop a powerful German fleet in the Baltic. The attempt has been crowned with success, and the purpose of the present manœuvres, which the Austrian and English fleets have been invited to witness, is simply to show Europe that Germany is ready for an attack also at this point.

SOCIAL TOPICS.

IS IT A WAR OF EXTERMINATION?

N. Y. Herald, Oct. 4.—Mr. H. Walter Webb is too big a man for New York to endure without peril to the public welfare.

What do we see? The New York Central has emerged from a serious strike. It was provoked by administrative incapacity and insolence. Its consequences were averted by the common sense of the labor leaders and the pressure of public opinion. The good name which the Central had earned by its considerate treatment of its employés, the personal esteem in which the principal owners and the president were held, contributed to an understanding. Nothing showed more clearly the conservative tendency of labor organizations than the quiet adjustment of a controversy in which the laborers were but partially at fault, and which, the more closely we read the after evidence, seems to have been precipitated by the recent indifference and ignorance of the Central management.

The strike over and done, Mr. H. Walter Webb writes a circular forbidding the employés of the Central to belong to the Knights of Labor. So long as the Central employés, switchmen, engineers, conductors, or what not, do their work, it is not the business of Mr. H. Walter Webb to make inquiry as to their associations.

This question concerns the inalienable rights of the American citizen, and it is incredible that Mr. Depew does not see it. Mr. Depew is a statesman with tact, a knowledge of men and affairs, has been a candidate for the nomination to the Presidency, and may again proudly look upon that high place. But does Mr. Depew believe it possible that at this day and hour a mere third vice-president of the New York Central owing his place to family ties, can say to an American citizen, even the humblest in his service, that he may not associate with his fellow-laborers, that he may not call himself a Knight of Labor or Knight of the Moon if he pleases, that he may not concert with his fellows as to wages, hours of work, charities, privileges—that he may not even come into the august presence of H. Walter Webb and state a grievance?

There is no contest so much to be deplored as that between labor and capital. Why a great corporation, existing by the grace of the Commonwealth and governed by an experienced statesman, should invite the issue, passes comprehension. The people are tired of it.

Mr. Depew should put aside the vanity of opinion and realize that his management has blundered. The American people will not endure, even from the Central, an interference with their liberties. Where corporations are concerned and bread and butter must be found for children, they are long suffering. But right is right and freedom is freedom, and unless this maxim governs those in high authority and swaying vast responsibilities, no one can tell what the end may be—nor with what terrible, relentless swiftness it may come.

N. Y. Sun, Oct. 4.—It was not surprising that there should have been various misconceptions upon such an unusual document as the New York's Central's declaration concerning the Knights of Labor; but we had not looked for the opinions expressed in so clear-headed and well-meaning a journal as the *New York Herald*. Our esteemed contemporary looks upon Mr. Webb's circular as "an attempt of associated capital to exterminate associated labor."

This attributes to the managers of the New York Central Railroad a degree of folly wholly unjustified by previous evidence, from within or without that organization. Organized labor cannot be exterminated. In these days the proposition to carry on any great business without contact with labor organizations is never entertained by any sane mind. There are a few concerns that succeed in doing it, but they are not only few, but extremely small, and their character of non-unionism is maintained always with the most vigilant and difficult defense and trouble. The idea of labor organization is for the day an element of human nature. Among those who have extended relations with laboring men in any way whatsoever, the only critics who denounce or discourage unions are such advanced philosophers as Mr. Henry George and Edward Atkinson, especially Mr. George, whose mind dwells chiefly on a future in which we shall have reached that stage of social and material perfection when society can have but one union, itself, for all conditions and purposes. But no one concerned with the present or its immediate prospects gives so much as a thought to the extermination of labor organizations, for the simple reason of its impossibility.

When labor unions dissolve, they will dissolve themselves. They will live until their time of usefulness is passed, and the interior sustaining force has gone out of them, but they will never be exterminated.

The Central's order, therefore, can reasonably raise nothing more than a question of its wisdom in regard to the special organization of the Knights of Labor. Such direct warfare as Mr. Webb represents, made upon any union, however atrocious, may arouse such a concentrated sentiment of sympathy that the result will be exactly the opposite to that desired.

But the course chosen involves the quality of prudence only. To say that opposition to Mr. Powderly's society means hostility to other unions amounts to a greater libel upon labor organization proper than its bitterest enemy ever conceived of; to say that it means a purpose to exterminate organization is making the Central officials out to be too great fools for facts to stand.

N. Y. Tribune, Oct. 4.—Various interpretations are put upon the circular issued by the management of the New York Central, instructing officials of the operating department as to the attitude of the company towards the Knights of Labor. Unnecessary ingenuity has been expended in these endeavors to find a meaning in this circular different from that which its plain language conveys.

The circular says that the company "objects to its employes being members of the organization known as the Knights of Labor," and that "the management is satisfied that membership in this particular organization is inconsistent with faithful and efficient service to the company, and is liable at any time to prevent it from properly discharging its duties to the public"; and heads of departments are instructed to bring the circular to the attention of the company's employes. It is fair to conclude from these declarations that Knights of Labor will not be taken into the company's employ hereafter, and that Knights now in its employ must sever their connection with the order or run the risk of being discharged at the option of the company. It is unfair to conclude that the circular means or implies more than this, and particularly that it is a declaration of war against all labor organizations. In fact, Mr. Webb has taken pains to affirm that it neither conveys nor conceals such a threat. It remains then for the public to determine whether the adoption of this course with reference to the Knights of Labor is justifiable and proper. In our opinion it is not only justifiable and proper, but as that organization is now constituted and governed, essential to the interests and rights of the public. Furthermore, we see no inconsistency between the action now taken and the declarations repeatedly made by Mr. Webb while the strike was in progress, that the company was not discharging or antagonizing Knights as such. The company and the public have learned, on the highest authority, the correspondence between Powderly and Lee, that the leaders of the Knights were engaged in an elaborate conspiracy to bring the company and the comfort and safety of the public into absolute subjection to themselves, no matter how serious might be the injury inflicted upon the company or upon the country. The railroad company which, having been officially warned of such a conspiracy as this, neglected any lawful means of thwarting it, would deserve to forfeit its charter. That is our opinion, and we are firmly convinced that it is public opinion.

In all this there is no attack upon or threat against organized labor—labor organized with that due regard for the public peace and comfort which the law exacts from every citizen.

New York Times, Oct. 3.—Whether or not the New York Central Railroad Company was "making war" upon the Knights of Labor at the time it discharged the employes whose dismissal led to the recent strike, the experience it has had since that time has induced it to "object" to having its men belong to that organization. Its objection has been very tersely stated in a circular addressed to the heads of departments in its service who have charge of the employment of labor, and its terms are not likely to be misunderstood. It evidently means that Knights of Labor will not be hereafter employed by the company, and that any who may be in its service now are expected to give up their membership in the order or their places in the employment of the company. It must be admitted that the conduct of the Knights of Labor in connection with the recent strike has justified this action

of the Central Road, and has shown that it is not safe for the public to have the labor employed upon railroads subject to the influences that are rife in the Powderly organization. Reckless strikes, boycotts, and violent interference with persons and property are something that no community can long tolerate in connection with railroad traffic.

Pittsburgh Dispatch, Oct. 5.—It is noticeable that the New York Central assumes, while Mr. Depew is present as its head, the position which he declared four years ago to be impossible for any employer to take—namely, that it can dictate to its employes as to whether they shall or shall not belong to a labor organization. The strike has given an excuse for this position; but the manifestation of the same spirit which caused the strike justifies the belief that it was the opportunity to take that position which was wanted, rather than the cause of this reversal of former professions.

The New York Central has shown itself in this affair to be beyond reason; but labor organizations should learn from it that strikes which fail are an offense against labor, and that quarrels between labor organizations are its most certain ruin.

THE BRICK BOYCOTT.

Hartford Courant, Oct. 3.—The "brick boycott" in New York City is off. The "Board of Walking Delegates" have declared it off. They say that an "amicable settlement" has been reached; also that they feel it "would not be wise to further paralyze the building industry of the city by holding out to enforce a few technicalities." Considerate and merciful Walking Delegates! How grateful New York ought to be for such moderation and magnanimity!

Springfield Republican, Oct. 3.—The Board of Walking Delegates have shown a degree of wisdom unusual in labor leaders, in ordering the boycott on Verplanck Point's brick off. The boycott never had any justification, and was sure to fail, either of keeping out the brick or bringing the manufacturers to terms. All it had accomplished was to organize all the manufacturers against the delegates and seriously disturb the building trades in New York City. So far the most serious consequences of this conflict had not been felt; but the time was at hand when either boycotted brick must be used or building practically cease in the city, and the army of workmen in those trades become idle. Rather than face this contingency, the delegates yielded, contrary to the advice of Powderly.

TEMPERANCE.

INTERNATIONAL PROHIBITION CONGRESS—A REMARKABLE BOSTON WOMAN.

Berlingske Tidende, Copenhagen, Sept. 7.—One of the most interesting members of the Third International Prohibition Congress, at Christiania, is certainly Mrs. Leavitt, from Boston. With truly American energy, she has travelled all the world over to study and to fight the steadily spreading and growing passion for drinking. She has visited the Sandwich Islands, Japan, China, the East Indies, Africa, etc. Wherever she comes, she stops for some time, makes observations, takes notes, forms acquaintances, exchanges experiences, delivers speeches and lectures in minor circles, establishes connections, and prepares the way for the introduction of remedial measures. She knows no other language than her native tongue. But her power of making herself understood and of understanding other people seems to be unlimited. She asks in English and is answered in Norwegian, but, though she may have only four or five words in common with her interlocutor, when the conversation is at end, her information is complete and her notes correct. Exceedingly impressive was her description of the influence

which the introduction of intoxicating beverages has upon peoples that have hitherto lived in ignorance of such blessings. The Second International Congress, held in Zurich, appointed a committee to aid the society, formed in London under the leadership of the Duke of Westminster, for the purpose of preventing the introduction of liquors in countries, in which they were likely to act upon the native population simply as a means of extermination. At the instance of that committee, the Slavery Congress of Brussels took up the question and obtained the consent of all European governments—except that of Holland—that trade in liquors should be absolutely forbidden in those regions of Africa into which it had not yet been introduced, and that it should be rigorously regulated in those where it already existed. But still further exertions are necessary in order to have the proper measures enforced, and Mrs. Leavitt's description of what she had seen among the Burmese and Karenese in Farther India, the Zulus and Hottentots in South Africa, the Negroes in Western Africa, etc., etc., roused the deepest indignation. Everywhere the natives fall the easy prey of the liquor-dealer's rapacity. They have absolutely no power of abstinence; they have even not the preventive wisdom of the educated drunkards; they simply drink till they die. In most places the European factory pays the native labor it uses in rum, and the wandering of such a keg of rum can be traced for many miles through the country by the miseries and murders it has caused. Thus the European colonist and even the European missionary often become a real curse to those peoples, because, unwittingly and unwillingly, they are the forerunner of the liquor-dealer, who, like the Satan of mediæval folklore, is always carrying his hell about with him, open and ready.

A NEBRASKA DEBATING SOCIETY.

Der Amerikanische Bierbrauer, New York, Oct.—"Now also have the spirits themselves taken part in the conflict."

On the 18th and 19th September the Prohibitionists and Anti-Prohibitionists, by their representatives, met at Grand Island, Nebraska, and resolved themselves into a debating society for the discussion of the problem, "Is it wise and expedient to include the proposed Prohibition Amendment in the State Constitution?" The Prohibitionists were represented by ex-Governor Larrabee of Iowa, ex-Attorney-General Bradford of Kansas and Mr. A. C. Rankin of Pennsylvania. On the other side appeared the Anti-Prohibitionists, Editor Rosewater of the Omaha *Bee* and Mr. John L. Webster of Omaha.

Rankin opened the ball. He devoted himself to the two arguments which the upholders of personal freedom had brought into the field, viz.: (1) That it is the abuse and not the use of spirituous liquors that should be assailed, and (2) that it is quite impossible to cure a drunkard by compulsory laws.

To the first he objected that it was impossible to tax the abuse only; no other course was open than to oppose the moderate and immoderate use alike by strong prohibitive laws. With regard to the second argument he contended that it was impossible to insure the application of Prohibition to the individual, but quite possible to prohibit the saloon. Larrabee contended against the proposition that the industrial progress of the Prohibition States is waning.

Editor Rosewater contended that the adoption of the Amendment would be a great calamity for Nebraska. The loss of the school fund alone constituted a serious argument against Prohibition. If interference is imperative, let it be confined to the inauguration of a more effective system of control. The point of Bradford's discourse was "The only way to control the liquor-dealer is to throw him down and set your feet upon him." High license, he said, was worse than free whiskey, and he instanced Omaha which with 240 gilded saloons paying \$1,000 license fee, showed

more crime than any other city of the Union excepting perhaps three.

Webster of Omaha rose and remarked that this was the second time he had been compelled to defend the good name of the State to which he belonged against the attacks of people who came from other States to teach the Nebraskans how to manage their own affairs. Omaha had lost the investment of four million dollars through fear of Prohibition.

The second day Governor Larrabee opened the debate with the proposition that a State which followed the lead of its best and purest men would be sure to prosper. The drink traffic must be forcibly suppressed, or it would soon be uncontrollable.

Anti-Prohibitionist Webster continued with a logic similar to that with which the Prohibitionists arm themselves, that Prohibition fosters secret drunkenness, and that it would consequently be a *sin* (and he may have added *shame*) if Prohibition were adopted in the Constitution.

Editor Rosewater at the close of his speech produced an affidavit to the effect that while Attorney-General Bradford was raging against the drink traffic in Kansas some repairs in his cellar led to the discovery of half a barrel of bottled beer. Bradford, who had already left for his hotel when this startling announcement was made, quickly returned and protested that he had been a total abstainer for thirty years.

We are at a loss to understand what possible benefit can result from such discussions unless it be to disabuse the Prohibitionists of the idea that we are unable to meet them in debate.

THE MAN OR THE PARTY?

The Voice, N. Y., Oct. 9.—There is no point on which the Prohibitionists have been more severely criticised than for their refusal to aid in the election of old-party candidates who are avowed temperance men. This course on the part of Prohibitionists seems to certain persons little short of treason to the cause of Prohibition. This criticism arises from a misconception of the purpose and belief that have given birth to the Prohibition Party. That purpose is to build up a political organization—a party—around the central issue of Prohibition. That belief is that until such an organization is perfected and made victorious, prohibitory law or constitutional amendment cannot be made secure. How then can we be expected to support a man who instead of giving his support to such an organization, supports a party that seeks to crush that organization out of existence? How can men who believe that a certain organization is *indispensable* to the cause of Prohibition, put clubs into the hands of the enemies of that organization, and then maintain any claim of consistency or sincerity?

How long, we wonder, will it take the American people to learn that a man in office without a political body behind him, is, as a reformer, either a very short-lived success, or an entire failure. How long will it take for us to learn that this is a *representative* form of Government. It is not the man, with his private views, but the representative, and *what he represents*, that we must vote for.

The inherent weakness of all citizens' movements lies in the fact that, unless they are organized as a *permanent* and distinct body, able to preserve their identity and strength through each successive partisan campaign, their representative, even if elected mayor, let us say, of a great city, finds himself practically alone, a stone hanging in the air, without organized support, and representing he knows not what or whom. Of all which the memorable citizens' movement in Brooklyn, with its brilliant success, and its lamentable collapse when the next Presidential campaign came around, is a fresh illustration.

The Prohibition Party is a party. It is not going to help into power men whose political interests and whose political convictions (if they are honest) require the death of that party. It is not going to help place in power men who in their *representative* character are

antagonistic to the principles of the party, whatever may be their individual views of politics, religion, science or art.

Our slogan still is, WE MAKE NO DEALS!

MISCELLANEOUS.

THE COMTE DE PARIS.

Philadelphia Ledger, Oct. 4.—Comte de Paris and party arrived in New York yesterday, and, true to his announced purpose, the Count refused to discuss French politics in any way. This is a wise resolution. As a soldier who voluntarily served in the Union Army during the war, and has since written a history of the great conflict, marked by a strong desire to deal fairly by every one, he is entitled to the highest honors that can be accorded a foreign visitor, the cordiality of which might be checked if French politics should be brought into the discussions arising at the entertainments to be given the party. As a man and a soldier, the Count may command as much respect from all Americans as he could gain from a few because of his titles and claims to the abolished throne of France.

Buffalo Times, Oct. 5.—As Lafayette was endeared to the hearts of the American people during the revolutionary struggle, so was the Comte de Paris during the war of the rebellion. His sympathies in the cause of freedom led him to come to this country during that struggle, and he lost no time in joining the Federal army. He was a brave soldier, and made a record of which either titled foreigner or humble peasant might well be proud. His reception in New York City on Friday, on the occasion of his arrival, was a pleasing recognition of the illustrious Frenchman's devotion to the Union cause in its hour of greatest need.

Pittsburgh Leader, Oct. 5.—It is just a little bit disgusting to see the people of this great republic grovel at the feet of the Bourbon scion of royalty who has condescended once more to favor us with his presence. There is nothing in the man to call forth enthusiasm or hero-worship. To be sure, he joined the armies of the Union in a very dark time, and perhaps by his mere presence did a little something to aid the cause. But, as we once before said in these columns, his coming was caused by no love of freedom but by the desire to gain military and strategical knowledge which would further his own selfish purpose to overthrow the liberties of his own country and force himself, the representative of a hated race, upon the people of his native land.

No greater exhibition of toadyism could be given, than for the liberty-loving people of free America to fall down and worship this enemy to the liberties of a free France.

Pittsburgh Dispatch, Oct. 4.—The Comte de Paris is America's guest once more, not officially, it is true, but in the hospitable sense of the word. He landed at New York yesterday, and, as the telegraphic dispatches show, received a very warm welcome from many of his old comrades in arms in the army of the Potomac. The distinguished Frenchman deserves the very best America has to give. He almost alone of the world's princes has earned the gratitude of this Republic. When he came here twenty-eight years ago his arms and brains were at the disposal of the National Government then in peril. To-day it is fitting that the Nation should remember all its defenders, and there are signs that the Comte de Paris will have to run the gauntlet of banquets and receptions given in his honor wherever he goes. We hope these festivities will not prove more dangerous than campaigning with McClellan on the Peninsula. If he will come to Pittsburgh he will find that

there is a warm corner in our hearts for the compatriot and emulator of Lafayette.

Columbus Dispatch, Oct. 4.—The Comte de Paris, representative of the royal line of France, with his son and a small party of royalists, landed in New York on Friday, and for a month will be the guest of the American people. Aside from his kingly aspirations, the Count is a welcome visitor to America, where as an officer in the Army of the Potomac, he rendered good service to the cause of the Union and made many friends.

While, as a princely pretender, the Comte de Paris will necessarily be held in some contempt, he has shown such ability in war and in literature that he must, as a man, always be entitled to respect. His "History of the Civil War in the United States" is a masterly discussion of military movements during the Rebellion, and his "Labor Unions in England" and "Damas et le Liban" stamp him as a student and scholar.

MORMON RENUNCIATION OF POLYGAMY.

N. Y. Tribune, Oct. 8.—Polygamy has officially been renounced by the Latter Day Saints. President Woodruff has issued an edict forbidding in the future plural marriages as in violation, not of the principles and practice of the Mormon Church, but of the laws of the land. The validity of this manifesto has been recognized by unanimous action of the apostles, bishops and elders. By this authoritative action, assuming that the hierarchy means what it says, the question of polygamy has been settled in Utah by the Mormons themselves, under pressure of Congressional legislation and the decisions of the United States Supreme Courts. Henceforth plural marriages will be condemned by the theocracy which has invested them with the factitious dignity of a religious institution. Whatever the future of Mormonism without polygamy may be, the Nation, assuming again the sincerity of this declaration, is relieved from the intolerable reproach of the social degradation caused by a revolting system of marriage in a portion of its Western domain. The new edict applies only to future marriages in Utah, but Polygamy, abandoned as a religious canon, will speedily cease to exist in the Mormon paradise. It is the first sacrifice that is made to the progress of Western settlement in the Territory. It will be followed speedily by encroachments upon the temporal power of the Mormon Church, and ultimately by the effacement of the religious denomination.

N. Y. Herald, Oct. 8.—The formal renunciation of polygamy by the Mormon Church is likely to bring up the question as to the admission of Utah into the Union. That Territory would have been a State long ago but for polygamy, and this crime has owed its existence, in defiance of the power and the sentiment of the nation, to the Mormon Church. If the Church is sincere in its renunciation, the institution is doomed to hasty extinction, and with it must disappear the obstacle to the admission of the Territory.

But are the Church authorities sincere? They have bowed to the inevitable. They have surrendered to the power of the United States, because they had no other alternative but to face the penalty of the law. But what assurance has the country that it is now safe to trust the Territory with the sovereignty of a State?

A Territory is the ward of the nation. It is subject to the control of the Federal Government. Congress may adopt the most stringent measures against any crime there, and the Federal courts may enforce them.

A State is sovereign. Its people are their own rulers. They may make polygamy lawful if they choose. Neither Congress nor any federal authority can interfere.

Index of Periodical Literature.

AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

BIOGRAPHICAL.

- Brooke, Stopford A. William Clarke. New Eng. Mag., Oct. 9 pp. Writer preacher, biographer, reformer and poet.
 Dante, Student Life of. (Concluded.) Lucia D. Pychowska. Cath. World, Oct., 6 pp.
 Hedge, Frederic Henry. Unitarian Rev., Oct., 21 pp. A sketch of his life and work.
 Hutchinson, Anne, A Study of. Edward E. Hale, D.D. New Eng. Mag., Oct., 7 pp.
 Mathew, Theobald. Most Rev. John Ireland, D.D. The Cath. World, Oct., 8 pp. A sketch of the life and work of Father Mathew.
 Newman, John Henry, as a Writer. John F. Genung, Ph. D. New Eng. Mag., Oct. 7 pp.

EDUCATION.

- Agricultural Education. James Knapp Reeve. New Eng. Mag., Oct., 8 pp.
 Massachusetts Agricultural College. President Henry H. Goodell. New Eng. Mag., Oct., 8 pp.
 Private School (The) for Girls. Mrs. Sylvanus Reed. Scribner's Mag., Oct., 11 pp. A sketch of the school founded by Mrs. Reed in 1864.
 Universities (American), The Future of. Andrew D. White, LL.D. North Am. Rev., Oct., 10 pp.

LITERATURE.

- "Above" and "Below." Horatio Hall. Jour. Amer. Folk-Lore, July-Sept. A mythological Disease of Language., 14 pp.
 Mythology (Apache), Notes on. John G. Bourke. Jour. Amer. Folk-Lore, July-Sept., 4 pp.
 Literary Young Woman (The). Kate Masterson. Drake's Mag., Oct., 3 pp. A short sketch.
 Puritan Poet (An Old). Helen Marshall North. New Eng. Mag., Oct., 4 pp. The Rev. Michael Wigglesworth, born in 1631.

POLITICAL.

- Balfour's (Mr.) Answer to Mr. Parnell. The Right Hon. John Morley, M.P. North Am. Rev., Oct., 12 pp. A critique of the Irish Minister's reply to the Irish leader.
 Municipal Reform, A Key to. E. L. Godkin. North Am. Rev., Oct., 10 pp. The writer reaches the conclusion that "the work of municipal reform is really a work of education."
 Pan-American Conference (The). M. Romero, The Mexican Minister. North Am. Rev., Oct., 15 pp.
 Speakership (The) A Word as to. James Bryce, M.P. North Am. Rev., Oct., 14 pp. Some considerations regarding the nature of the Speaker's office and the best modes of dealing with obstruction.
 Turkish Question (The), A Glimpse at. Aaron Godfrey. Drake's Mag., Oct., 2 pp.

RELIGIOUS.

- Catholic Truth, Criteria of. Cath. World, Oct., 8 pp.
 Christ, What Think Ye Of? The Rev. A. D. Olds, A.M. Quar. Rev. United Brethren, Oct., 13 pp.
 Church Fathers (The), Authority of. The Rev. Z. A. Weidler, A.M. Quar. Rev. United Brethren, Oct., 5 pp. A consideration of the nature and characteristics of the Patristic writings.
 Conversion (A) Sixty Years Ago, The story of. Cath. World, Oct., 13 pp. Record of the conversion to the Roman Catholic faith of Louisa Hartwell, daughter of Sir Francis Hartwell.
 Faith and Credulity. John Burroughs. North Am. Rev., Oct., 8 pp. A discrimination between Faith and Credulity.
 John The Forerunner. Austin Bierbower. Unitarian Rev., Oct., 17 pp. Refers to the work of John the Baptist and St. Paul as distinguished from that of Jesus.
 Newman's (Cardinal) Philosophy of Religion. Rev. Wm. Barry, D.D. Cath. World, Oct., 15 pp.
 Pulpit (The) and the Minister. Charles E. Perkins. Unitarian Rev., 11 pp. A statement of changes which have affected the religious ministry; the claims of the modern pulpit upon the attention of the people; the functions of the minister out of the pulpit.
 Religion (A soul-satisfying), Essential elements of. Prof. W. H. Klinefelter, D.D. Quar. Rev., United Brethren, Oct., 11 pp.
 Religion of the Fathers. Edgar Buckingham. Unitarian Rev., Oct., 8 pp. A review of the religious spirit of the Puritan Fathers.
 Religious Toleration, Birth of; or, The Hand of the Sanctuary. William Gray Brooks. Cath. World, Oct., 10 pp. The establishment of religious liberty in Maryland, by Cecil Calvert.
 Three Voices From the Tombs. Prof. J. A. Weller, D.D., Ph.D. Quar. Rev. United Brethren, Oct., 9 pp. The voices of infidelity, of nature, of revelation.

SCIENTIFIC.

- America, Nature and Man in. N. S. Shaler. Scribner's Mag., Oct., 11 pp. The second paper concerning the influence of geographic features in the development of the peoples on this continent.
 Bright's Disease, Insanity as a symptom of. Alice Bennett, M.D. Buffalo Med. and Surgical Jour., Oct., 31 pp.
 Dolmens and Standing Stones of France, Symbolism among. Prof. A. S. Packard. American Antiquarian, Sept., 10 pp.
 Northern Lights, or Wa-ba-ba-nal. Mrs. W. Wallace Brown. Jour. American Folk-Lore, July-Sept., 2 pp. An Indian Legend.
 Vulvæ, Kraurosis. Charles N. Smith, M.D. Buffalo Med. and Surgical Jour., Oct., 4 pp.

SOCIOLOGICAL.

- Charities, Three London. Unitarian Rev., Oct., 9 pp. Description of the pla-

of "university extension" proposed by Mrs. Ward, Toynbee Hall, and the People's Palace.

- Chinese in America, Customs of. Stewart Culin. Jour. Amer. Folk-Lore, July-Sept., 10 pp.
 Devil (The), A Scheme of. The Rev. H. A. Thompson, D. D., LL.D. Quar. Rev. United Brethren, Oct., 16 pp. High License as applied to the Liquor Traffic.
 Gentile System (The) of the Siletz Tribes. J. Owen Dorsey. Jour. Amer. Folk-Lore, July-Sept., 11 pp.
 Indian Question (The), Past and Present. Herbert Welsh. New Eng. Mag., Oct., 10 pp.
 Irish Character, The Moral effects of Misgovernment upon. Richard Ashe King. Cath. World, Oct., 11 pp.
 Labor Tendencies in Great Britain. Michael Davitt. North Am. Rev., Oct., 16 pp.
 South (The) Peculiarities of. Prof. N. S. Shaler. North Am. Rev., Oct., 11 pp. Observations on the differences between the characteristic Northern and Southern people of the United States.

UNCLASSIFIED.

- American Girls in Europe. Madame Adam. North Am. Rev., Oct., 8 pp. American Girls in Europe from a European point of view.
 Backgammon, The Symbolism of. W. W. Newell. Jour. Amer. Folk-Lore, July-Sept.
 Cable Expedition, with a. Herbert Laws Webb. Scribner's Mag., Oct., 16 pp. Narrative of the writer's experiences on the cable-ship Dalmatia in 1883.
 City House (The) in the West. John W. Root. Scribner's Mag., Oct., 19 pp. Descriptive of houses in Western cities.
 Cotton Industry (The) in New England. George Rich. New Eng. Mag., Oct., 24 pp.
 Crowns and Coronets. George P. A. Healy. North Am. Rev., Oct., 11 pp. Reminiscences of a Portrait-Painter.
 England, Where She Legislates. Ashton R. Willard. New Eng. Mag., Oct., 10 pp. Descriptive of the Houses of Parliament.
 Folk-Lore (Negro) and Witchcraft in the South, Notes on. Louis Pendleton. Jour. Amer. Folk-Lore, July-Sept.
 Glooscap, Cuhkw and Coolpurjot. The Rev. Silas T. Rand. American Antiquarian, Sept., 4 pp. An Indian Legend.
 Gombay, a Festal Rite of Bermudian Negroes. H. C. Bolton. Jour. Amer. Folk-Lore, July-Sept., 5 pp.
 Indian and Mound-builders' Relics, The Difference Between. Stephen D. Peet, American Antiquarian, Sept., 21 pp.
 Medicine Men, The Omaha Buffalo. Francis La Flesche. Jour. Amer. Folk-Lore, July-Sept., 7 pp. An account of their method and practice.
 New England, The Lake Country of. Newman Smythe. Scribner's Mag., Oct., 14 pp.
 Pawtucket and the Slater Centennial. The Rev. Massena Goodrich. New Eng. Mag., Oct., 17 pp.
 Sand-Waves at Henlopen and Hatteras. John R. Spear. Scribner's Mag., Oct., 6 pp.
 White Squadron (The), From Port to Port with. Rufus Fairchild Zogbaum. Scribner's Mag., Oct., 19 pp. Second of the writer's articles on his recent cruise.

FRENCH.

BIOGRAPHICAL.

- Berlioz, Hector. Camille Saint-Saëns, La Lecture, Paris, Sept. 25, 8 pp. Critical remarks on the composer Berlioz.
 Edison, Le Roman d', Louis Figuier, La Lecture, Paris, Sept. 10, 11 pp. Second and last paper narrating romantic incidents in the life of Edison, the inventor.
 Gentilshommes Démocrates. Vicomte de Noailles. Marquis de Castellane, La Nouvelle Revue, Paris, Sept. 15, 19 pp. Second and last paper on the Vicomte de Noailles, brother-in-law of Lafayette, considered as a nobleman with democratic opinions.
 Livingston, Vie et Voyages de D., (Life and Travels of David Livingstone.) Henry M. Stanley, La Lecture, Paris, Sept. 25, 17 pp. First instalment.

DESCRIPTIVE.

- Lacs Anglais. (Les). Paul Bourget, La Lecture, Paris, Sept. 10, 12 pp. Last of four papers describing the English lake country of Wordsworth.
 Question Arménienne (La). Le vilayet de Trebizonde. Lydie Paschkof, Revue Bleue, Paris, Sept. 20, 3 pp. Description of the district of Trebizond in Asia Minor.
 Russie, Notes sur la, Revue Bleue, Paris, Sept. 20, 3 pp. Descriptive notes on Russia by a delegate to the International Congress at St. Petersburg, last summer. Second of a series of papers.
 Tonnelier (Le). André Theuriet, La Lecture, Paris, Sept. 25, 6 pp. Description of the cooper and the way he makes casks in vintage time.

FICTION.

- Ce que l'on voit tous les jours (What one sees every day). Alexandre Dumas, fils, La Lecture, Paris, Sept. 25, 18 pp. First instalment of a novel.
 L'Héritage. Guy de Maupassant, La Lecture, Paris, Sept. 10, 11 pp. Fourth and last instalment of a story.
 Histoire d'une Sebile. Jules Grolous, Revue Bleue, Paris, Sept. 20, 14 pp. Story of a wooden bowl.
 L'Homme de Lettres, Dialogue d'il y a dix ans. Édouard Rod, La Nouvelle Revue, Sept. 15, 23 pp. A dialogue supposed to have taken place ten years ago about the man of letters.
 Rendez-vous (Un). Luigi Gualdo, La Nouvelle Revue, Paris, Sept. 15, 10 pp. Short story.
 Roi Apépi (Le). Victor Cherbuliez, La Lecture, Paris, Sept. 10 and 25, 17-18 pp. First and second instalments of a novel.
 Roman d'une conspiration (Le). A. Rane, La Lecture, Paris, Sept. 10, 11 pp. Ninth and last instalment of a novellette, "The Romance of a Conspiracy."
 Sœur Philomène. R. et J. de Goncourt, La Lecture, Paris, Sept. 10 and 25, 21-24 pp. Third and fourth instalments of a story, "Sister Philomena."

Books of the Week.

AMERICAN.

- Abyssinia, Through: An envoy's ride to the King of Zion. F. Harrison Smith. C. Armstrong & Son. Cl. \$2.
- American Ancestry; giving the name and descent of Americans whose ancestors settled in the U. S. previous to 1776. Joel Munsell's Sons, Albany. Cl. \$5.
- Ardis Claverden. Frank R. Stockton. Dodd, Mead & Co. Cl. \$1.50.
- Bible (the), and Inspiration: an inquiry. Rob. F. Horton. E. P. Dutton & Co. Cl. \$1.25.
- Bismarck intime; the Iron Chancellor in private life. By a fellow-student. Appleton. Pap. 50c.
- Bonaparte, Citizeness. Imbert de Saint-Amand. C. Scribner's Sons. Cl. \$1.25.
- British Church (The Early), The Monumental History of, J. Romilly Allen. E. & J. B. Young & Co. Cl. \$1.25.
- Butterflies of the Eastern United States and Canada. Hubbard S. Scudder. 3 vols. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Hf. levant \$75.
- Children of Gibeon: a novel. Walter Besant. Harper's. Pap. 50c.
- Dix, Dorothea Lynde, Life of, Francis Tiffany. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Cl. \$1.50.
- Electricity (Practical) in Medicine and Surgery. G. A. Liebig, Jr., and G. H. Rohé, M.D. F. A. Davis, Phil. Cl. \$2.
- Episcopal Church (American), History of, S. D. McConnell, D.D. T. Whittaker. Cl. \$2.
- Europe, A Summer Holiday in, Mary Elizabeth Blake. Lee & Shepard Cl. \$1.25.
- Europe, The History of Civilization in, François P. G. Guizot. Tr. by W. Hazlitt. A. L. Burt. Cl. \$1; Hf. cf. \$2.
- Far-west Sketches. Jesse Benton Frémont. D. Lothrop & Co., Bost. Cl. \$1.
- God, belief in; its origin, nature and basis. Jacob Gould Schurman. C. Scribner's Sons. Cl. \$1.25.
- Greek Pictures, drawn with pen and pencil. J. P. Mahaffy, D.D. Fleming H. Revell, N. Y. and Chic. Cl. \$3.20.
- In Trust; or, Dr. Bertrand's Household. Amanda M. Douglas. Lee & Shepard, Bost. Pap. 50c.
- Maine, *Supreme Ct. Reports of Cases*. C. Hamlin. (1889-90.) Loring, Short & Harmon, Portland. Shp. \$4.
- New York, Complete Election Code. Weed, Parsons & Co., Alb. Pap. \$1.50.
- New York, Digest of the Chancery Reports. The Lawyers' Co-op. Pub. Co., Rochester. Shp. \$5.
- New York, General Statutes for the Year 1890, etc., etc. Weed, Parsons & Co., Alb. Shp. \$2.
- Our Mother Tongue. Theodore H. Mead. Dodd, Mead & Co. Cl. \$1.50.
- Pellow, Thomas, The Adventures of. Macmillan & Co. Cl. \$1.50.
- Persia: Eastern Mission: A narrative of the founding of the Eastern Persian Mission, etc., etc. The Rev. Ja. Bassett, Pres. Bd. of Pub., Phila. Cl. \$1.25.
- Philosophy, Introduction to, Turnbull G. Ladd. C. Scribner's Sons. Cl. \$3.
- Physiology (Comparative), A text-book of; for students and practitioners of veterinary medicine. Wesley Mills, M.D. Appleton. Cl. \$5.
- Psychology, The Elements of, Gabriel Campayré. Lee & Shepard, Bost. Cl. \$1.
- Prohibition, The Economics of. James C. Fernald. Funk & Wagnalls.
- Roman Catholicism in America [*also*], The Catholic Democracy of America. J. Murphy & Co., Balt. Pap. 25c.
- Spaniel (the), and its training; to which is added the American and English Spaniel standards. F. H. F. Mercer. Forest and Stream Pub. Co. Cl. \$1.
- Spiders (American) and their spinning work; a natural history of the orb-weaving spiders of the United States. H. C. McCook, D.D. Dr. H. C. McCook, 3700 Chestnut st., Phil. Cl. \$10.
- St. Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux. S. J. Eales. E. & J. B. Young & Co. Cl. 80c.
- Sugar Analysis; for refineries, sugar-houses, experimental stations, etc. Ferdinand G. Weichmann. J. Wiley & Sons. Clo. \$2; interleaved, \$3.50.
- Tonal System, The septonate and the centralization of; a new view of the fundamental relations of tones and a simplification of the theory and practice of music. Julius Klausner. W. Rohlfing & Sons, Milwaukee. Cl. \$3.
- United States Army, from its organization in 1789 to 1889. F. B. Heitman. Office of the *National Tribune*, Wash., D. C. Cl. \$8.
- United States. Public land laws passed by Congress from April, 1882, to Jan., 1890, etc., etc. H. N. Copp. Wash., D. C. Shp. \$9.
- Wider Hope (The), Essays and strictures on the doctrine and literature of future punishment. E. P. Dutton & Co. Cl. \$1.25.
- World (The) and the Man. Hugh Miller Thompson. T. Whittaker. Cl. \$1.25.

FRENCH.

- Algerie, Carte géologique de—Directeurs, M.M. Pomel et Pouyanne. In-4°, 330 pages. Fontana et Cie, Algiers.
- Auvergne, Une mois en—Par Alba. In-8°, p. 179, avec gravures. Ardant et Cie, Limoges.
- Bactériacées, Contribution à l'étude de la morphologie et du développement des—Albert Billet, docteur en médecine. In-8°, 215 p. Danel, Lille.
- Casanova, Amours et Aventures de—Casanova. Tomes 3. In-16°, p. 479 à 716 avec gravures. Simon et Cie, Paris.
- Contes joyeux, publiés par Emil Blain. Tomes 4. In-16°, pages 729 à 956, avec gravures. Simon et Cie, Paris.
- Domremy pays de Jeanne d'Arc, Étude historique et géographique sur—J. C. Chapellier, bibliothécaire de la ville d'Épinal. In-8°, 49 pages et plans. Humbert, Saint Dié.
- Fortification de champ de bataille, Influence des engins nouveaux sur la—L. Bonnefon, capitaine du génie. In-8°, 93 p. Berger-Leorault et Cie, Paris.

France, Les Etapes d'un touriste en, Tout autour de Paris. Promenades et Excursions dans le département de la Seine. Alexis Martin. In-18° Jésus, xxiv.-317 p., avec 20 gravures hors texte, 2 vues panoramiques et 5 cartes et plans colories. Hennuyer, Paris.

Haïti, La Banque Nationale d', Une page d'histoire. Frédéric Marcelin, ancien député président du tribunal de commerce de Port au Prince. In-8°, 115 p. Kugelman, Paris.

Iconographie malacologique des animaux mollusques fluviatiles du lac Tanganyika. J. R. Bourguignat, Secrétaire général de la Société Malacologique de France. Grand in-8°, 82 pages et planches. Crété, Corbeil.

"L'Influenza," parodie du "Pater" de François Coppée, lever de rideau, en un acte, en vers. Gustav de Muhs et René des Gaches. In-8°, 23 p. Imprimerie de l'Académie normande. Carentan.

Jeanne d'Arc. See Domremy.

Jeune Fille, Journal d'une—Madame Adèle Lizieux. In-8°, 179 pages avec 6 gravures. Ardant et Cie, Limoges.

Current Events.

Thursday, Oct. 2.

Sir John Macdonald, the Premier, and other members of the Canadian Government make speeches at Halifax criticising the Tariff Law..... Fire in Sydney, N. S. W., causes a loss of £1,500,000..... The Limerick Corporation adopts a resolution censuring the Government for the Tipperary arrests..... Anti-Semitic members are elected to the Lower Austrian Diet from Vienna.

Friday Oct. 3.

Speaker Reed addresses a large meeting at New Haven, Conn..... A. J. Cassett and Henry G. Davis accept the appointment of International Railroad Commissioners..... The Comte de Paris and the Duc d'Orleans arrive in N. Y. City..... The ninetieth birthday of George Bancroft, the historian.

Mr. Harrington, Counsel for Dillon and O'Brien, is ordered by the magistrate to leave the case; the trial is adjourned amid great confusion..... The New Portuguese Cabinet is formed..... 1,000 men at Armstrong's ship-yard in London go on a strike..... A treaty is signed by Germany and Zanzibar relative to the coasting trade along the east coast of Africa; the German Government pays the Sultan of Zanzibar 4,000,000 marks for the concession.

Saturday, Oct. 4.

The Massachusetts Club holds its annual dinner in Boston; addresses by Henry Cabot Lodge and other prominent Republicans..... Senator Spooner makes a speech in Milwaukee in defense of the Wisconsin School Law..... The Custom House in N. Y. City is kept open until midnight, to allow cargoes of incoming vessels to be received under the old Tariff Law..... Postmaster-General Wanamaker advocates, in a letter to General Bingham, the limited postal telegraph scheme.

Sunday, Oct. 5.

The Argentine Congress at Buenos Ayres passes the Conversion Law..... A treaty of peace between France and the King of Dahomey is concluded and the French Admiral raises the blockade..... The popular vote in the Canton of Ticino, Switzerland, shows 11,928 for and 11,834 against revision, a victory for the revolutionary party.

Monday, Oct. 6.

The Comte de Paris visits General McClellan's grave at Trenton..... Columbia College reopens..... In New York City the Republican and Democratic County Conventions appoint a committee to consider the advisability of joining in a fusion ticket..... The site for the Grant monument is selected at 123d street and Riverside Drive..... The Putnam County, N. Y., Republican Convention nominates Hamilton Fish, Jr., for the Assembly..... The 61st Conference of the Mormon Church at Salt Lake City decides to abolish polygamy..... The new Tariff Law goes into effect.

At a Conference of Irish Nationalists held in Dublin, a deputation is appointed to visit the United States to plead the cause of Ireland..... The Prince of Wales visits Vienna..... The appointment of General von Kattenborn Strachan as German Minister of War is officially announced.

Tuesday, Oct. 7.

The Comte de Paris arrives in Washington..... A reception is tendered to William Walter Phelps by the Englewood Club..... The Committee on the Revision of the Westminster Confession meet at Allegheny City, Pa.

A panic is caused in Buenos Ayres by a rumor that a new revolution had broken out; detachments of cavalry patrol the streets..... Thomas P. Gill, a member of the Irish mission to America, sails for the United States..... The International Literary Congress in London discuss the copyright question..... The French Cabinet authorizes the Minister of Commerce to frame a High Tariff Bill with reciprocity provisions..... Sir Henry Drummond Wolff, British Envoy to Persia, dying.

Wednesday, Oct. 8.

The American Board of Foreign Missions begins its 81st annual meeting in Minneapolis..... The Committee of the Board of Harvard College report unfavorably as to the shortening of the college course..... Opening of the 8th Annual Indian Conference at Lake Mohonk..... President Harrison addresses the veterans of his old brigade at Galesburg, Ill.

Premier Crispi, at a banquet in Florence, denounces the Irredentist Agitators..... The reports of an impending revolution in Buenos Ayres are denied..... Corn porters in London, in the employ of the Allan and the Wilson-Hall lines of steamers, strike for "obligation" and "stench" money..... The Brazilian Government favorably receives France's proposal for a copy right treaty.